DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 113 JC 700 074

AUTHOR	Roberts, Dayton Y., Ed.
TITLE	New Deans of Students: Old Problems, New Answers. Conference Proceedings.
INSTITUTION	Florida Univ., Gainesville. Coll. of Education.; Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellog (W.K.) Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	104p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.30
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel, *College Deans, *Counseling, Institutional Research, *Junior Colleges, Student Needs, *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

A conference, sponsored by the Institute of Higher Education and the Department of Personnel Services at the University of Florida, was held for new deans of students of junior colleges. These administrators are primarily responsible for coordinating, evaluating, and upgrading the student personnel program--the main focus of this conference. Conference speakers addressed themselves to such topics as the importance of staff selection in terms of the goals of the college, the leadership role of the dean, the contribution of student personnel workers in the total college environment, the needs of junior college students, and the importance of evaluating student personnel programs. (BB)

ED038113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NEW DEANS OF STUDENTS:

OLD PROBLEMS, NEW ANSWERS

Conference Proceedings

Edited by
Dayton Y. Roberts

Sponsored

by

Institute of Higher Education

and

Department of Personnel Services

College of Education

University of Florida

Host Institution

Santa Fe Junior College

August 3-6, 1969

Gainesville, Florida

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 18 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Under a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

JC 700 074

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction iii

Program 1

Address by Dr. Clifford LeBlanc:
PREVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE - "GETTING THE SET" 4

Address by Dr. Jane Matson:
STAFF SELECTION - "HOW TO PICK THEM" 9

Address by Dr. Terry O'Banion:
STAFF DEVELOPMENT - "HOW TO TURN THEM ON" 18

Address by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson:
ROLE OF STUDENT PERSONNEL IN TOTAL COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT - "BEYOND ANCILLARY SERVICES" 37

Address by Dr. James Harvey:
JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS - "WHO ARE THEY? WHAT ARE THEIR NEEDS?" . 51

Address by Dr. Joseph Fordyce:
EVALUATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS - "IF IT EXISTS, IT CAN BE MEASURED" 80

Conference Summary by Dr. James L. Wattenbarger 93

Participants 99

INTRODUCTION

The increase in the number of new community junior colleges in the country has created a continuing need for special attention to new administrative personnel. Although many of these new administrators have come from other positions in higher education, there still is a sizable number who have had no experience with junior colleges prior to assuming their present positions.

The Southeastern Junior College Leadership Center, jointly conducted by the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida and the Department of Higher Education, Florida State University, has given particular attention to the needs of these new personnel for junior colleges. This invitational conference-workshop was one of a series of conferences for new junior college administrative personnel sponsored by the Center since 1961. It was the first of these conferences to be designed specifically for new, first-time-in-service Deans of Students of junior colleges.

Dayton Y. Roberts
Assistant Director
Institute of Higher Education

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Rubye Beal, Co-Chairman
Clifford LeBlanc, Co-Chairman
Dayton Roberts
Marlin Schmidt
Robert Stripling
James Wattenbarger

PROGRAM

Sunday, August 3, 1969

7:00 P.M. Social and Dinner - "Friendship First"

Chairman: Dr. Rubye Beal, Dean for Counseling and Educational Planning, Santa Fe Junior College

Welcome: Dr. Joseph Fordyce, President, Santa Fe Junior College

Preview of Conference - "Getting the Set"
Dr. Clifford LeBlanc, Vice President for Student Affairs, Santa Fe Junior College

Meeting of Small Groups

Monday, August 4, 1969

8:30 A.M. Staff Selection - "How to Pick Them"

Chairman: Mr. Tal Mullis, Director, Common Program, Santa Fe Junior College

Presentation - Dr. Jane Matson, Professor of Education, California State College at Los Angeles

Small Group Reactions
(Speaker participates in groups)

10:00 A.M. Coffee

10:45 A.M. Staff Development - "How To Turn Them On"

Chairman: Mr. Ed Hayes, Director, Pupil Personnel Services, Alachua County

Presentation - Dr. Terry O'Banion, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, University of Illinois

	Small Group Reactions (Speaker participates in groups)
12:15 P.M.	Lunch Break
1:30 P.M.	Feedback of Small Groups to Total Conference
2:30 P.M.	Coffee
3:00 P.M.	Role of Student Personnel in Total College Environment - "Beyond Ancillary Services" Chairman: Dr. Dayton Y. Roberts, Associate Professor and Assistant Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida Presentation - Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, University of California at Los Angeles Small Group Reactions (Speaker participates in groups)
7:00 P.M.	Feedback of Small Groups to Total Conference
Tuesday, August 5, 1969	
8:30 A.M.	Junior College Students - "Who Are They? What Are Their Needs?" Chairman: Mr. James Watson, Student, Santa Fe Junior College Presentation - Dr. James Harvey, Dean of Students, William Rainey Harper Community College Small Group Reactions (Speaker participates in groups)
10:00 A.M.	Coffee
10:45 A.M.	Student Activities - "Let's Look At The Concept" Chairman: Mr. Gary Resnick, Student, Santa Fe Junior College

	Conversation - Dr. Les Goldman, Director of Student Activities, Santa Fe Junior College, Dr. Bud Gilligan, Dean of Student Personnel, Central Florida Junior College Small Group Reactions (Speakers participate in groups)
12:15 P.M.	Lunch Break
1:30 P.M.	Feedback of Small Groups to Total Conference
2:30 P.M.	Coffee
3:00 P.M.	Evaluation of Student Personnel Programs, "If It Exists, It Can Be Measured" Chairman: Dr. James Lister, Professor of Education and Chairman, Department of Personnel Services, University of Florida Presentation - Dr. Joseph Fordyce, President, Santa Fe Junior College Panel of Consultants: Dr. Matson, Dr. O'Banion, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Harvey
6:30 P.M.	Social Hour

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

9:00 A.M.	The Challenge Before Us - "Where Are We Going From Here?" Chairman: Dr. Marlin Schmidt, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Florida Conference Summary - Dr. James L. Wattenbarger Professor and Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida

PREVIEW OF CONFERENCE, "GETTING THE SET"

Clifford R. LeBlanc
Vice President for Student Affairs
Santa Fe Junior College

I would like to begin by saying that I feel an identification with you because I have just completed my first year as Vice President for Student Affairs...a year that has been demanding, frustrating, exciting, and rewarding. And, if time permitted, there are many feelings and experiences that I would like to share with you this evening.

Over the past ten years, I have been either teacher or counselor from the elementary grades through graduate school and, in the phraseology commonly in vogue, "This is where it's happening". I am confident that the challenge that is student personnel work in the junior college includes all the demands of its counterpart in both secondary schools and in four-year colleges, with many that are significant only to the junior college. And, because of the nature and scope of the challenge, pupil personnel work in the community college has a singular opportunity to come to full fruition. The major responsibility to achieve this goal falls to you as chief administrators. I will address myself to this point in a moment.

I do not plan to overview in detail the problem areas chosen as the focus of this conference. The group of distinguished educators who are serving as our consultants are eminently more qualified than I to deal in detail with major topics. I would like to comment, however, that the problem areas deliniated are not exhaustive, they are only representative of those with which a new dean may have to deal. Also, the conference program actually reflects areas which we at Santa Fe have addressed ourselves to over the past year and which we have assigned priority importance to in the development of our own pupil personnel program. Other problems, no less significant, are easy to ennumerate (i.e., merit evaluation of individual staff members, administrative staffing of specific services, conceptualization of the interrelatedness of the counseling function with the specific services, and program development.) In truth, the basic problem confronting us all as personnel workers may be survival. And, it might be that this entire conference should more realistically address itself to whether we will survive as a profession and what are we to do it we are to prevail.

I am not a pessimist, but I do believe that student personnel is still fighting an up-hill battle for equal partnership with its academic counterpart. And, in spite of a few outstanding examples to the contrary, a significant number of pupil personnel programs reflect insufficient budgetary support and staffing inadequate to guarantee at least a fair opportunity for program effectiveness. What are we to do, as chief administrators, to bring about change?

I think, because we are possibly in the adolesence of our development, that we are experiencing an identity problem. In an effort to establish our role in the school, we seem to have ignored our being or essence. I think it is high time we establish our identity as educators, and to see our role as that of providing, as Terry O'Banion has written, "the climate and conditions in which the greatest possible development of potential and fulfillment can take place". And, I would like to add that we must go beyond our immediate consideration for students and extend this growth facilitating environment to include all who are representative of the college community...students, staff, teachers, administrators, and the community-at-large. As counselors become more involved, as they operate "on the cutting edge" as we say at Santa Fe, they may obviate their image as narrow specialists who perform psychological lobotomies on reluctant subjects in sound proof cubicles. And, as they begin to function where the action is they are much more likely to address themselves to the amelioration of value and attitudinal conflicts where they occur--among people in interaction.

I also believe deeply that pupil personnel work needs greater visibility. Whereas teachers can more easily point to rather tangible accomplishments, outcomes of counseling effectiveness are much harder to evidence. Therefore, as chief administrators I would encourage efforts on your part to develop programs or projects which can result in greater visibility for your staff and more tangibly reflect your efforts. Such programs should draw upon the expertise special to well prepared counselors, and might aim at the preparation of para-professionals in the helping professions. Examples here at Santa Fe, under the leadership of Dr. Stanly Lynch, Director of the Behavioral Science Program, include the training of counselor and teacher aides and of early childhood para-professionals. Also subsumed under Dr. Lynch's leadership is a highly successful work skill evaluation and instruction program developed in collaboration with the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. In this effort, disadvantaged male and female adults, some with serious personal problems, learn job entry skills, and, at the same time receive intensive occupational and personal counseling as one major emphasis of the program. Counselor-aides, in training, receive valuable experience of a practical nature as they work beside professional staff counselors. Thus, the Behavioral Science programs, while mainly instructional in nature, demands close association between teachers and counselors due to the special needs of its students. Consequently, student personnel workers are intimately involved in curriculum development.

In conclusion, I would entreat each of you to enlarge your perspective of the challenge that is pupil personnel work. The western penchant for isolating problems for attack and solution, while pragmatic, sometimes desensitizes us to the whole Gestalt of what we are all about. Therefore, as we approach the experiences of the following few days on a task or problem oriented basis, try to keep in mind the globalness of the experience that is the community college. And, I would like to remind you of the importance of what we are attempting to accomplish by quoting, "the purpose of education is to help each man experience more fully, live more broadly, perceive more keenly, feel more deeply, and to find happiness in self-fulfillment and gain the wisdom to see that this is inextricably tied to the welfare of others". I am certain that the only educational institution that addresses itself to the inclusiveness and vision of the above statement of purpose is the community junior college.

STAFF SELECTION
"HOW TO PICK THEM"

Jane E. Matson
Professor of Education
Director, EPDA Student Personnel Institute
California State College, Los Angeles

When a junior college is being considered for admission to the community college world's own mythical Hall of Fame, the ultimate judgment of how well it defined and achieved its goals and objectives will be a reflection in large measure of the efforts of the human beings who labored to produce the college and its records. For a college--as is true of most social organizations--has no real existence apart from those who either serve it or are served by it and these two groups have overlapping membership.

The first staff appointment, usually the president or chief administrator, has an awesome influence on the development of a college. So many decisions must be made before the first student is admitted, that it is not surprising that those appointed very early in the planning or development stage of a college acquire an almost propriary identification with the institution. To a significant extent these early decisions determine the nature of the college, including the composition of its student population, its curricular offerings, as well as the community's image of the college. But it should be noted that--while the burden of responsibility borne by each successive appointment diminishes as the number of staff increases--each appointment has a contributory influence on the nature of the college. The "picking" process, therefore, plays an extremely vital role in shaping the dimensions of a college and it is entirely appropriate for a group such as this to give attention to it.

Consideration of this "picking" process can be organized around five major areas:

1. For what are we "picking?"
2. When are we doing the "picking?"
3. What are we looking for?
4. How can we know when we have found it?
5. What is the future likely to hold--will the "picking" become more difficult or easier?

First--For what are we "picking?"

It is necessary here to define the boundaries of the student personnel area within a college. The functions assigned to or classified as student personnel vary widely from college to college and reflect, in large measure, the philosophy of those responsible for the early patterns of organization. For our purposes the student personnel area is defined as including the twenty-one functions identified in the Carnegie study. These include:[1]

---

[1] Collins, Charles C., Junior College Student Personnel Programs: What They Are And What They Should Be, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967, pp. 13-15.

Orientation Functions

1. Precollege Information
2. Student Induction
3. Group Orientation
4. Career Information

Appraisal Functions

5. Personnel Records
6. Educational Testing
7. Applicant Appraisal
7a. Health Appraisal

Consultation Functions

8. Student Counseling
9. Student Advisement
10. Applicant Consulting

Participation Functions

11. Co-Curricular Activities
12. Student Self-Government

Regulation Functions

13. Student Registration
14. Academic Regulation
15. Social Regulation

Service Functions

16. Financial Aids
17. Placement

Organizational Functions

18. Program Articulation
19. In-Service Education
20. Program Evaluation
21. Administrative Organization

The selection of staff--a risky business at best--is likely to lead to catastrophe unless positions to be filled have been well-defined and their particular functions in the over-all mission of the college clearly identified. These job definitions or descriptions are the logical source of specifications which candidates are to meet. They may also serve as guides to flexibility in specifications should modification be necessary in order to make an appointment to the job. Once job descriptions have been prepared, they must be periodically reviewed and revised, as student services respond to a changing dynamic college.

The order or priority in which student services are to be provided must also be clearly determined since most newly-established junior colleges do not have a fully-staffed program of student services at the time of opening or perhaps even for several years following the start of operation. Because student personnel staff frequently must wear several "hats" during the early years of the college, it is especially important to determine which "hats" go with which positions.

The counseling function has traditionally been considered the keystone of the student services area and is usually the first to be staffed--often with greater care and discrimination than in the case of other student services which follow. Exception to this timing might be the admission and records function but this is not always assigned to the student personnel area or may not be perceived as demanding a high degree of professional competence.

The first essential, then, for good "picking" is to know not only what jobs are to be filled, and their dimensions in as specific terms as possible, but also the function of these jobs in relation to the college's total program.

Second--When is the "picking" to be done?

The time factor in staff selection has two dimensions, both of significance. One is the stage of life of the college and the other is the professional "age" of the individual being considered for a position. Set formula for determining the proper relationship between these two dimensions are not, to my knowledge, readily available. But the maturity of a college and the professional maturity of its staff are not completely independent variables and need to be studied carefully.

To borrow a term from the machinists' trade, the degree of tolerance which can be permitted in meeting the specifications derived from job definitions will depend on such factors as 1) the developmental stage through which the college is progressing, 2) the actual and potential resources in the already appointed staff and 3) the available pool of candidates for the jobs. There are times in the life of a college and its programs of student services when it is crucial that there be only minimal, if any, deviation from job specifications while at other periods, a greater tolerance is acceptable. In other words, it is possible that an unfilled position is preferable--in terms of the ultimate welfare of the college--to filling it with an individual who is only minimally qualified. It is a skillful administrator who can determine the wiser course of decision in this situation.

Third--What are we looking for?

What criteria can be used in the search for staff? Certainly specific criteria will vary with the particular situation but for any junior college, at any stage in its development, there is a common core of qualities of its staff members which might be considered the sine qua non of employment criteria.

Since I am presently associated with a student personnel professional preparation program, you may expect me to speak of formal training or degree requirements. On the contrary--while I consider them, perhaps desirable (and now is not the appropriate time for me to explain why I no longer say "essential")--I do believe there are criteria of more vital importance, at the moment. Among these are:

1. Attitudes and values which are consistent with the philosophy of the community junior college and its role of extending educational opportunity to an ever-broadening cross-section of the population.
2. A personal commitment to this philosophy and its hierarchy of values which produces a high degree of enthusiasm for tackling the difficult task of implementation.
3. Knowledge and skills appropriate to the tasks to be performed, made evident through demonstrated competencies and accompanied by a high degree of flexibility or adaptiveness which makes it possible to "roll with the punches" which occur in any job on occasion.
4. Personal qualities and aspirations which reflect a reasonably accurate appraisal and acceptance of one's capacities with willingness to grow and develop but, at the same time, a well-established sense of self-worth and personal security. (The degree to which an individual possesses these qualities or has the capacity to develop them is not easy to determine. It is less difficult to recognize the complete or almost complete absence of them.)

This brings us to the fourth area of consideration of our topic--How can we know when we have those who should be "picked?"

The appraisal of candidates for jobs is tricky business. No one knows that better than student personnel specialists. The methods and tools we have available are much less accurate, generally, than those used to appraise jewels, art objects, painting, or real estate. We are beginning to suspect our too long reliance on symbols--either in terms of letters after one's name or by numbers indicating grade point average, rank in class or scores on a variety of tests. I do not have time here to review the amazing procedures commonly used in the trading processes of the academic market-place--the bartering, the mumbo-jumbo of incantations and the offerings to the "gods" are as worthy of an anthropologist's study as are the mysteries of tribal ceremonies. Instead I would like to comment briefly on some practices commonly used in the junior college job market:

1. First a word about who is involved--in the past the staff selection process was almost totally a function of the administrator. This is becoming increasingly less true. Staff selection is seen in some colleges now as a responsibility of the total college and it is done by groups representative of all members of the college community. This trend can only serve to improve the quality of the staff selection process. It is especially important that the role and responsibility of students in staff selection and indeed, retention and tenure as well, be clearly recognized.

Once the responsibility for staff selection has been placed in appropriate hands, the techniques to be used must be considered. Here there is room for much creativity and innovation. The use of placement papers compiled by college or university placement offices, has not proven especially helpful, other than to provide some factual data, sometimes pertinent and sometimes not. The general, vague letters of recommendation included in them are frequently irrelevant to the job at hand or are a better reflection of the writer's biases than a description of the applicant's virtues or weaknesses.

Application forms are not universally helpful. Some--like college admission applications--ignore pertinent data but compile an assortment of vital statistics of little import--and at best are a poor reflection of the human being who laboriously fills them out.

Increasingly, "picking" of staff is done only after a personal interview with the applicant. This presents obvious difficulties--with limited budgets it is not feasible to support extensive travel on the part of either candidates or college staff. This restriction may contribute to an unfortunate kind of provincialism which can limit staff quality. There is no readily evident way to resolve this dilemma since the practice of interviewing candidates is certainly desirable. One possible means of getting the maximum value from travel funds is to make use of the placement services provided at national, state and regional meetings of professional organizations where often a large group of possible candidates can be, at least, initially screened.

The somewhat novel method used by the President and Dean of Students in the early staffing of Santa Fe Junior College presents promising possibilities. Applicants were asked to respond in writing to a series of questions designed to reveal some of the qualities mentioned earlier. This is admittedly time-consuming but such a procedure does provide an opportunity for pre-screening and has a certain face validity. It would be interesting to explore the relationship between performance on the job and the responses submitted as part of the selection process. Finally--What is the future likely to hold?

There can be little doubt that the "picking" process will become much more difficult. The available pool of well-qualified student personnel specialists is woefully inadequate to meet the demand growing out of the rapid establishment of new community colleges and the equally rapid growth of existing ones. Another factor which compounds the difficulty is the metamorphosis which the student personnel field is undergoing. The demarcation between student personnel functions seems to be coming less sharp while at the same time the specific skills and knowledge needed to achieve student personnel objectives are growing more complex. The number of institutions of higher education offering graduate preparation which is even remotely appropriate for those preparing to work in a community junior college is pitifully small. There is no more important task facing new deans of students or chief administrators responsible for the student personnel program than that of selecting a professional staff to define and implement the program's goals and objectives. It is not an easy task and you will not always "hit the target" but with the professional competence, ingenuity and creativity which I am sure this group possesses, the field of junior college student personnel work will move ahead.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT
"HOW TO TURN THEM ON"

Terry O'Banion
Assistant Professor of Higher Education
University of Illinois

I know with what little honor prophets are held in their own country, and I must confess to some small amount of discomfort as I return home after two years in the Midwest to discuss the subject of staff development while several members of my former staff sit in the audience. When I left Gainesville, however, I did not, in the manner of prophets, shake the sand from my sandals, for as all good Floridians know once you have sand in your shoes you have no other choice but to return to Florida time and time again. My own shoes support feet of clay so I hope my friends will be kind to me if the concepts I describe in this presentation far exceed my own practice as a dean of students responsible for staff development.

Before I discuss the role of the dean of students as the person primarily responsible for staff development I would like to make three assumptions that are necessary for such a discussion; 1) if staff development is to be seen as an important part of the work of the educational instutition then I believe it is particularly important that the dean of students have institutional support for that activity. Specifically, I believe this means that the president must support the dean of students in his role as staff development officer. The president must believe that the institution has a responsibility for fostering the personal and professional development of staff members, or the dean of students will constantly be frustrated in his attempts to do so. Such institutional support is likely to come when the president believes in the validity of a student personnel program. Presidential support is, I believe, perhaps the most important factor in the development of a student personnel program and, therefore, the development of staff members in the student personnel program.

The kind of support that is needed is reflected in a statement by Joseph Cosand, President of St. Louis Junior College District when he says,

> "As president of a comprehensive junior college I believe strongly that the student personnel program on the campus must be given the same status as the instructional program. For that reason I feel that the administrative structure should have a dean of student personnel services and a dean of instruction at the same level in the organizational chart, both of whom would be responsible to the president of the college."

Not only should the president support the dean of students on an equal line relationship with the dean of instruction, but he should have an understanding and a commitment to the goals of student personnel work which are reflected in a statement by Joseph W. Fordyce, President of Santa Fe Junior College,

> "I am convinced that student personnel work can and must come to full fruition in the comprehensive junior college. No other educational institution can afford the broad expanse of educational opportunities that provide a setting in which students' choices can be so fully implemented. By the same token students generally have reached a level of maturity in a time of life when most important decisions

> can and must be made. Opportunities and necessities then combine to make the junior college the ideal setting for the most effective student personnel programs."

When presidents support student personnel work as these two presidents do then the chief student personnel officer is likely to be soundly supported in his attempt to function in his role as chief development officer for his own staff. Without such support the dean of students who is deeply committed to student personnel philosophy will only be frustrated in his attempts to create a democratic staff island amid a network of rigid bureaucratic controls, and he will do so at considerable psychic cost both to himself and to his staff with a corresponding loss of creativity.

A second assumption that I would make is that the chief student personnel officer, if he is to be successful in providing opportunities for the development of his staff, must be primarily concerned with the selection of staff in the first place. In short, he must select the right people if he is to have a significant role in their development. I believe that it is important for a chief student personnel administrator to choose those who share his belief systems so that he can develop a sense of commitment and a sense of mission that are necessary to muster the resources of his staff if the staff is to have any real effect on the institution. A diversity of points of view which is one of the great democratic shibboleths of our time does not necessarily contribute to the development of an effective student personnel program and may result in a complete shambles of student personnel hermits isolated within the confines of their own points of view. I am not asking here for a stultifying homogeneity, but only indicating that there is no program if one staff member wants to practice individual therapy with only five students a day in his own private quarters and another staff member is interested only in keeping efficient records of class attendance in the admissions office. There must be a central commitment of all staff members to a central focus for the program. The Student Personnel Point of View first developed in 1937 reflects, I believe, what that central focus should be and in the present time is best represented by a program focused on humanitarian-democratic ideals in which it is believed that all human beings can live richer, fuller lives and that each should be provided opportunities to become all he is capable of becoming. If such a philosophy is the focus of the dean of students and he selects people who do not support that philosophy then his attempts to develop staff both in terms of their own person and in terms of the team effort that will have an impact on the institution will be seriously hindered.

A third assumption that I would make that is perhaps of particular importance to this discussion and one which seems rather obvious is that the dean of students must be an extremely capable person. The student personnel program is the length and shadow of the dean of students. If he is not qualified to perform as a professional in his position he can provide little leadership for the development of his own staff. I make this obvious point because it is one of such serious moment. In the Carnegie study one of the most startling discoveries for me was the conclusion,

> "Those functions designed to coordinate, evaluate, and upgrade student personnel programs are ineffective in 9 out of 10 institutions."

This said to me that the dean of students, who is primarily responsible for coordinating, evaluating, and upgrading the student personnel program or if you will, who is responsible for staff development, is doing an inadequate job in 9 out of 10 institutions. Put another way, in the approximately 1000 junior colleges in this country only 100 deans of students are effective as they attempt to provide leadership for the development of their own staff.

It is alarming to me that only one-tenth of the deans of students in this country are effective educational leaders in their own programs. While these figures were true several years ago there is not much reason to believe they have changed significantly. Hopefully, through workshops such as this and through new models and new roles for deans of students that are beginning to emerge we can help allay the rather discouraging findings of the Carnegie study.

With these assumptions as background, what is the role of the dean of students who wishes to develop to the maximum degree the potential of his own staff?

I have consulted in about 20 junior colleges this year in the area of student personnel and have had a very good opportunity to observe the role of the dean of students in relationship to his staff. From these observations and from others in previous years I have come to the conclusion that the primary problem in ineffective student personnel programs is poor interrelationships among the staff and often between the dean of students and his staff. When I find the rare staff that functions well as a team they seem to transcend or at least relegate to some degree of unimportance the usual kinds of problems that completely engulf other staffs in which the degree of inter-personal relationship is extremely poor. From these perceptions of ineffective roles I have learned some things that a dean of students does not do if he wishes to perform effectively as the person primarily responsible for the development of his own staff.

He does not act as a watchman and guardian hovering over the comings and goings of his staff. I once watched a new dean of students who stood at the door of the administration building every morning to check his staff in. He always had some comment about the time of their entrance into the building, and if they were late there was always a negative comment even though the dean attempted to couch it in humor. In such a situation the dean of students becomes an institutional joke who represents perhaps too clearly the mistrustful climate that probably permeates his program. You don't "turn them on" by "turning them in."

On the other hand, the dean of students does not leave staff alone. In an East Coast junior college this year a dean of students interviewed one of our students from the University of Illinois and indicated to him "We hire good staff and then leave them alone to do their job." I do not believe that a dean of students who wants to help his staff develop their own potential and, therefore, the potential of the student personnel program leaves his staff alone. Too often deans of students feel they are practicing the ultimate in democracy when they assign each staff member an area in which to function and then assume some responsibility themselves for a student personnel function or two with little coordination and leadership for the development of staff and program. The dean of students is not simply another member of the staff responsible for discipline and for completing state and federal reports. He is the leader of the staff constantly giving direction and providing encouragement for his staff members.

I recall talking with two counselors last fall who were very discouraged in their new positions because they never had an opportunity to be involved with the dean of students. They had come to this junior college because they had heard the dean of students speak at a meeting and had had an opportunity to talk with him about some of his exciting ideas over a late afternoon beer. They were so attracted to his ideas and to his style that they both accepted jobs with him on the spot. When I met them on the job four months later they were very discouraged because the dean of students had "left them alone" and had not involved them as they had wished to be involved with him in the development of the program.

If the dean of students is to release staff potential he does not act in such a way as to restrict, reproof, repress, rebuff and reprimand the activities of his staff. I often detect a hidden agenda of hostility in which the dean of students is at war with his staff. In such a system staff members become agents of espionage reporting deanly indiscretions to the organized resistance during coffee breaks.

The dean retaliates by issuing memos with not so subtle messages and practices parsimony in the distributions of pencils and legal pads. Mistrust compounds mistrust and any hope of developing a strong student personnel program is drained away in the energies required to survive in a lethal environment.

We could discuss here at great length many of the tactics of the dean of students who hinders staff development and in many cases who actually diminishes members of his staff. It is perhaps helpful to discuss some of these negative aspects so that we can review our own behavior but it is more helpful to describe positive aspects of the dean of students who would function effectively as the person primarily responsible for the development of his staff. For the dean of students who would function effectively in this role I believe his primary focus should be on releasing staff potential. A term that has come to have meaning for me as a description of the person in this role is that of the human development facilitator. Facilitate is an encountering verb, one that goes out to others and engages them in their emerging potential. Who is the human development facilitator and what is his role?

The kind of person who reflects the concept of the human development facilitator that I would like to see has been described quite well by such concepts as Maslow's self-actualizing person, Horney's self-realizing person, Privette's transcendent-functioning personality and Rogers' fully-functioning person. Other humanistic psychologists such as Combs, Jourard, Moustakas, May and Landsman have also described dimensions of this healthy personality. Such healthy personalities are described as open to experiences, democratic, accepting, understanding, caring, supporting, approving, loving, non-judgmental. They tend to agree with the lady artist in Tennessee Williams' play Night of the Iguana who said, "Nothing human is disgusting." They tolerate ambiguity. Their decisions come from within rather than from without. They have a zest for life, for experiencing, for touching, tasting, feeling, knowing. They risk involvement; they reach out for experiences; they are not afraid to encounter others. They believe that man is basically good and given the right conditions will move in positive directions. They believe that every student is a gifted student, that every student has untapped potentialities, that every human being can live a much fuller life than he is currently experiencing. They are not only interested in the sick students, they are interested in all students, helping those who are unhealthy to become more healthy and helping those who are already healthy to achieve yet even greater health. They are interested in positive human experiences more than negative human experiences, and they believe that all human beings desire to live richer, fuller lives.

The dean of students who facilitates staff holds these ideals for his staff as well as for the students of the college. He is to his staff as his staff is to students. He focuses energy on releasing the potentiality of his staff just as his staff members focus their energies on releasing the potentiality of students. He does not hide behind the time worn and weak lament of many deans of students who say "I don't have time to work with staff because I feel as if the dean of students ought to work with students." I would not go so far as to suggest that deans of students should never work directly with students, but I would go so far as to say that such should be a luxury that should follow only when deans have successfully worked for as full a development as possible on their own staff members.

I believe that in reality the dean of students serves to model behavior for his staff. People in leadership positions always serve as models of behavior, both bad and good. Think for a moment of the impact of John Kennedy on this country when literally millions of people modeled their behavior on his. The dean of students is often a model for the behavior of students and often is chosen purposely by the president to serve as a model for students. This was especially true in the earlier, calmer, and more self-contained colleges. But the dean of students also serves very directly as a behavior model for his own staff and that recognition often makes deans of students very uncomfortable. A feeling of discomfort comes when deans of students feel that they have a greater responsibility than others and that somehow they have to act "better" or behave more properly than staff members. I believe that such an expectation for one's self is an outmoded, impossible, and perhaps even destructive point of view. Deans of students are quite human. They have clay feet along with all others who hold leadership positions. Deans of students do not always have to operate from positions of strength and positions of rightness. When they can share their doubts and weaknesses, when they can be open to their own growth and development, when they can indicate their own need for support and caring, they will model very human behavior which will likely be much more facilitative for themselves and for others. Such modeling of behavior, if it avoids the maudlin and the syrupy, can be one of the most facilitative activities of the dean of students as he works with his staff.

We have outlined briefly the nature of the dean of students as a human development facilitator and have indicated that he serves in the role of modeling behavior. How does he model such behavior? How does he facilitate the development of his staff?

Primarily the dean of students involves the staff in the development of the student personnel program, relying on the strengths of individual staff members to bring the expertise they have to bear on major decisions regarding program development. The dean of students develops a climate of "participative administration" which has been described by Gibb,

> "It seems to me that joint, inter-dependent, and shared planning is a central concept to the kind of participative consultative leadership that we are considering...our assumption is that the blocks to innovation and creativity are fear, poor communication, imposition of motivations, and the dependency-rebellion syndrome of forces. People are innovative and creative. The administration of innovation involves freeing the creativity that is always present. The administrative problem of innovation is to remove fear and increase trust, to remove coercive, persuasional, and manipulative efforts to pump motivation, and to remove the tight controls on behavior that tend to channel creative efforts into circumvention, counter-strategy, and organizational survival rather than into innovative and creative problem solving."

I believe this statement by Gibb means that the dean of students involves all staff members in all major decisions affecting the development of the student personnel program. I sat in a staff meeting this fall in a Midwest junior college when the dean of students and registrar explained to the staff a federal project they had written that would affect the entire structure and development of the student personnel program. This was the first time staff members had heard about the project and they were quite miffed to learn about it when it had been completed and submitted. When they asked why they had not been called upon to participate in the development of the project or at least be informed about it the dean of students indicated that a deadline had to be met for submitting the project and there simply was not time to involve the staff. I believe this action was a very serious mistake of the dean of students. A brief memo inviting interested staff members to participate in the development of the proposal or at least informing them that such development was taking place would have been sufficient if time for submitting the proposal was a serious factor. If the dean chose this action as a way of getting the proposal through because it might have met with resistance from the staff he now has only compounded his problems. Staff members who are not involved in the major decisions that direct the development of the program will at best only partially support such activities and at worst may undermine them completely.

In addition to involving staff in major decisions affecting program development I believe the dean of students who would purposely and positively facilitate the development of his staff is sensitive to the various environmental conditions of the work situation, both the physical and psychological. The dean of students who disregards the personal importance staff members attach to such things as the color of drapes, pictures on the wall, and the design of the furniture jeopardizes in very obvious ways his role as facilitator of the staff. Each of us likes to have our idiosyncracy nurtured. When the dean of students fails to listen to the individual needs of his staff members and insists instead on some conformity that may be dictated by the business manager's need for simplicity in purchasing and ordering or his own needs to exercise his authority he fails to remember one of the basic statements of philosophy in the student personnel point of view; each person is an individual and has worth and dignity in his own right.

The dean of students should be particularly sensitive to the size of office, location of office, and whether or not offices have windows. A great deal of status gets to be assigned to these factors, and the dean of students should be aware of their importance in terms of staff morale. In a very healthy climate, environment probably ceases to be a very important factor, but it can become a focus for immense hostility and can become the front upon which battles are openly waged when there is a hidden agenda of hostility among staff members.

Other factors also affect the functioning of staff members. Are there sufficient clerical services so that staff members don't have to pound out their own memos on typewriters? Do secretaries understand and act in their own role as facilitators for the work of staff members?

Is there an understanding of the need for privacy in counseling and a respect from the dean of students, secretaries, and others regarding the closed door of staff members? Does the telephone system operate on a system of trust or does the student personnel staff member have to get clearance from the dean of students' secretary or the operator to make long distance telephone calls?

The dean of students should also take a great deal of interest in the professional development of his staff members. He should encourage them and participate with them in attending professional meetings in his region, state, and, if possible, national conventions and conferences. He should encourage membership in professional organizations and should encourage staff members to keep up with the professional journals in their fields. Hopefully, he can convince the administration that it is money well spent if the college purchases for all staff members at least an annual subscription to the Junior College Journal, if not other journals. He encourages his staff members and supports them in their research efforts, providing released time and clerical personnel for research and evaluation that will be beneficial to the program. He encourages staff members to continue their own professional preparation and if universities are nearby provides opportunities for released time so they can continue professional study.

Another role for the dean of students is to run interference for his staff. He represents the student personnel program in the administrative council, to the rest of the college, and to the community as well as to the profession at large. When staff members develop new and creative approaches to student development problems he finds a way to finance the activity or he finds the space to house it and he creates released time so the staff member can work on it. He says to his staff, "Use me to create the opportunities for you to do your work well." And he rewards staff by giving them the recognition they deserve; he gives personal compliments, informs the president and the local press.

During the peak periods of activity the dean of students shares in the nitty-gritty of the day-to-day operation. He rolls up his sleeves and goes to work in the registration lines. He works on Saturdays to get the grades out and he takes his share of the advisees who crowd the reception room. He does so in order to experience the rigorous effort that his staff expends on the firing line and to participate in the joy of working side by side with a staff as they do their work well.

These are only a few of the activities in which the dean of students uses his energy and his expertise in developing his staff to its full potential. He does more, however, than simply to provide opportunities and conditions under which staff can develop best. He is a facilitator of the potential of others, but he is also a person with much potential himself. He is a student personnel professional. He has expertise in the area of student development. He has his own ideas and he constantly acts as a resource person for his staff as they search for new approaches for working with students. He is constantly challenging his staff with new approaches and new practices. He is hopefully a creative person who can spark the creativity of others. He is hopefully committed to innovation and experimentation and is constantly asking, "Can we do it better?" His style is to encourage and to support, but he is also creator and innovator, a leader in his own right.

The major vehicles, other than the day-to-day involvement with staff, through which the dean of students accomplishes these purposes are the time honored in-service education program and the newer basic or human encounter group. Staff development is ever a constant activity of the dean of students, but it may be helpful to formalize some of the activities in an in-service education program. In some in-service programs a monthly staff meeting is devoted to a professional topic or issue of great concern to staff members. Consultants may be brought in, visitations made, or professional issues debated. Such sessions can be very helpful for the development of staff if they are well organized and if some steps are taken to insure the implementation of new actions as a result of such meetings. Too often staff members fail to relate in-service programs to the day-to-day operation and the impact is slight on the staff, and, therefore, on program development. I hope that any formal in-service program would always be followed by the task session in which the dean of students would ask, "Now what does this mean for what we do?"

An approach that has been used by industry for years as a vehicle for staff development and that has been used more recently by educators and student personnel staffs in particular is that of the human encounter group. I know of dozens of junior college staffs around the country that are participating in weekly or monthly encounter groups for the personal development of staff members. In encounter groups staff members have opportunities to remove the role-masks that often hinder the day-to-day communication of people who work closely together. They come to appreciate the uniqueness and the individuality of persons. In the encounter group there is an opportunity to express the caring that is usually present among people who spend a great deal of time together unless the wrong conditions have created a climate in which caring cannot be expressed. There is an opportunity to express and explore the anger and the frustration that keeps staff members from performing at their best and an opportunity to commit oneself to behavioral changes that will lead to better personal functioning and better staff relationships.

I believe the group encounter holds a great deal of promise for the development of student personnel staff members, but I believe that it is serious business. During the last year I have participated in fly-by-night encounters that last until the dawn with student personnel staffs in a motel in Maryland, in the back of a convention room in Iowa, and around a swimming pool in Kentucky. In the stimulating environment of conventions and under the influence of bourbon staff members will open themselves to encounter and confrontation. I believe that such openness is healthy and can lead to greater fruition of staff development. I do not believe, however, that one night stands of five to ten hour durations provide the best vehicles for staff development. Under such circumstances staff members may do little more than fondle psyches for group titillation and open wounds which may lead to more closed relationships on Monday morning. The group encounter is a good vehicle, but it takes a serious commitment and a commitment that involves no small amount of time over a period of time. I am not saying that even an hour session or a weekend session are not helpful. I am only saying that if a staff wishes to develop itself as fully as possible through the group encounter it needs to make a commitment, a time commitment which will allow the full exploration of anger and pain, and a time to fully experience the joy and pleasure of relationship.

The dean of students who sees a major part of his role as facilitating the development of his staff would probably ask the question of himself and his staff, "We spend more time in our offices, in our work environment, than in our homes, perhaps more than in any other of our life activities. How can we develop, therefore, a climate so that each of us can fully develop the potential that we have as persons and as professionals? How can we work toward a relationship in which each of us can learn to feel more deeply, experience more broadly and live more fully and provide the same opportunity for students and the faculty in the educational community which we serve?"

Out of that question I believe the dean of students builds a sense of commitment, community, and mission. Out of their sense of commitment to facilitate the development of others comes a community of professionals who have a mission in the institution and the community in which they work. Out of their sense of commitment, community and mission the student personnel staff becomes a force in the college and in the community, a force that will have significant impact in releasing the potential of students, faculty, citizens, and the student personnel staff itself.

In that kind of climate the student personnel staff will say, "We are our brothers' keepers, but we are also our brothers -- to the extent that we function well as persons and professionals to that extent we serve the institution well." Staff members need care, perhaps even more so than do students. If you as new deans of students will provide for the needs of your staff I don't believe that you will have to worry about the needs of your students.

ROLE OF STUDENT PERSONNEL IN TOTAL COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT "BEYOND ANCILLARY SERVICES"

B. Lamar Johnson
University of California, Los Angeles

Williamson points out that "the term 'student personnel work' refers both to a program of organized services for students and to a point of view about these students."[1]

He further explains "....student personnel work....is as broad, in purposes and methods as is the range of human nature, as wide as the ever-expanding and deepening knowledge of human nature, and as deep as our slowly increasing fund of verified knowledge of ways and means to aid individuals in developing optimally through the organized learning experiences available in our colleges and universities."[2]

In essence, Williamson exhorts the student personnel worker to assert with conviction, "Don't fence me in!" To a degree, under this concept, student personnel services may be as all-encompassing as education--or perhaps as inclusive as life itself. This viewpoint is one which could, without difficulty, lead to argument and debate.

It is not my purpose this afternoon to be drawn into a controversy, regarding niceties of definition. I do, however, want to explain that in preparing this paper I have assumed a definition of student personnel services which includes but is not limited to such functions as admission, registration and records, counseling, orientation, health service, student activities, financial aid, placement, and discipline.

---

[1] E. G. Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 3.

[2] ibid., p. 35.

It is my purpose in this presentation to identify and discuss two neglected functions of student personnel services. I shall not consider shortcomings in such fields as orientation, counseling, and student activities. If I were to do this, I would be bringing coals to Newcastle for you are better informed than I regarding deficiencies in these areas. I propose, however, to discuss two responsibilities--opportunities, if you will--which are too often neglected in both the literature on student personnel work and operationally in student personnel programs. I am referring, first to research; and second, to the improvement of the curriculum and instruction.

As a background for considering these areas, I should like to quote a statement from General Education in Action, a book I wrote, which was published in 1952:

> *By assembling and making available information regarding students; by making staff members aware of the problems, abilities, goals, and interests of individual students; by giving the administration data upon which to base sound policy and procedures, the guidance program can provide a motivating force and directional focus for the entire general education program.*[3]

---

[3] B. Lamar Johnson, General Education in Action (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952), p. 77.

At that time, I was referring to advising, guidance, and counseling as these are related to general education. I today rephrase my assertion of seventeen years ago as I assert, "The student personnel program can provide a motivating force and directional focus for the entire educational program of the American junior college."

A. Research

The junior college is a teaching institution. Accordingly, when I suggest research as a neglected function, I do not have in mind pure research designed to advance the frontiers of knowledge. Rather I refer to institutional research primarily designed to provide data on the basis of which programs can be developed and evaluated.

The importance of research designed to evaluate student personnel programs as a basis for improvement is recognized in the literature. Mueller, for example, refers to the importance of "on-the-job investigation, of and by and for the persons who will eventually make use of it--for example, a study of the personnel program."[4]

Similarly, Williamson points out the value of research as an aid to improving student personnel programs as he observes, "...continuous emphasis on the desirability of research to isolate and analyze deficiencies and effectiveness centers the staff's attention upon the upgrading of services."[5]

---

[4] Kate Hevner Mueller, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 551.

[5] Williamson, op. cit., pp. 121-122.

Despite the recognition of the importance of evaluating student personnel programs, we know that operationally all too little is done in this field. I, therefore, identify such action research as a neglected function of student personnel services. Actually, however, this is not the research which I primarily have in mind when I refer to research as a neglected function of student personnel services.

The neglected function to which I refer is college-wide institutional research. It is my considered judgment that student personnel services can desirably serve as a central focus for junior college programs of institutional research.

In this connection, it is significant to note that in the junior colleges of our nation, institutional research studies on students far outnumber those in any other category.

In 1961, I found that more than one-third (35.4 percent) of the reports of institutional research made by junior colleges in Western states were on students.[6]

More recently Roueche and Boggs in a 1968 national survey of junior college institutional research reported, "The area that receives the greatest junior college research emphasis is students--these studies account for forty-two percent of all institutional research studies."[7] If to this 42 percent are added the seven percent of the reports which deal with "student personnel services," it will be noted that approximately half of the studies are directly on students.

---

[6] B. Lamar Johnson, "Institutional Research in the Junior Colleges of Western States," Institutional Research in the Junior College (Occasional Report No. 3 from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program. Los Angeles: School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1962), p.25.

[7] John E. Roueche and John R. Boggs, Junior College Institutional Research (Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968), p. 47.

Our colleges must be student centered. Institutional research must be student centered. Studies involving students have relevance for the curriculum, for teaching, for admission--and also for finance, administration, and community service. The student personnel program can, with validity, provide leadership in college-wide institutional research. Such leadership is greatly needed. This is, I again suggest, a neglected function--a neglected opportunity of junior college student personnel services.

B. Improvement of the Curriculum and Instruction

A second function of student personnel service which is neglected is the improvement of the curriculum and instruction. If instruction is--as it should be--student centered, it must be based on the needs and characteristics of students. Accordingly, it would seem to be obvious that the student personnel staff--the staff which best knows students and their characteristics--should be directly and actively involved in the development of the curriculum and in the improvement of instruction. Rarely, however, do we find such involvement. Upon occasion counselors teach. Also upon occasion, the dean of students and/or other staff members serve on curriculum committees--typically, however, in a rather perfunctory fashion. All too seldom, do student personnel service staff members contribute to vitalizing curriculum planning and teaching by effectively focusing attention on the needs, abilities, achievements, goals and aspirations of students.

At times, to be sure, data regarding students are widely made available to staff members. Too often, however, such data are accepted by instructors as "handouts from student personnel." Seldom do teachers and members of the student personnel staff work together in a fashion that achieves a united educational team. This is, however, a possibility--an ideal to be attained.

For more than twenty years I was dean of instruction at Stephens College--at that time a junior college. On more than one occasion, I have asserted that the student personnel program contributed more to the improvement of instruction at Stephens College than any other single factor.

One characteristic of the student personnel program at Stephens College which made its contribution to the improvement of instruction possible was this: all members of the teaching faculty were actively involved in the student personnel program. Every instructor was, for example, a faculty advisor. And serving as an advisor at Stephens was no perfunctory responsibility. The faculty participated in an active in-service education program designed to help them become more effective advisors. In this program attention was given to limitations in the types of advising they could be expected to provide. Advisors were informed in some detail regarding the professional counseling and other personnel services available at the college. They were enjoined to draw upon, and in particular to have their advisees draw upon, such services. Under the "Stephens plan" professional counseling was upgraded and became increasingly important--as advisors aided advisees to draw upon the total resources of the student personnel program.

On several days during the year, classes were canceled and entire days were given over to advisors' conferences with their advisees.

Another facet of faculty participation in the student personnel program at Stephens College was the involvement of instructors in case conferences. When a student was having serious difficulties, her advisor, any one of her instructors, or any other staff member who worked with her, could request a case conference. Instructors, advisor, a representative of the counseling staff--all of those worked with a particular student--took part in the case conference. At such a conference, each person who worked with the student reported such information and insights as he had regarding her. Views, insights and judgments were shared--and plans made for working with the student.

In many situations, case conferences led to plans which resulted in improved student achievement. Equally as important as what happened to students, was, however, what happened to faculty participants. It was impossible to participate in such case conferences without achieving a better understanding of students which contributed notably to the development of a student-centered instructional program.

In reporting a survey of faculty participation in counseling, Hardee quotes this response from one college: "Counseling provides the basis for the faculty to know and understand students better...."[8] This assertion is certainly supported by my experience and observations at Stephens College.

---

[8] Melvene Draheim Hardee, The Faculty in College Counseling (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 44.

There were two purposes in having faculty-wide participation in the student personnel program at Stephens College: First, to improve the advising and counseling of students; Second, to contribute to faculty understanding of students, their interests, their goals and their needs.

It is clear that faculty participation in the student personnel program was successful in contributing to these ends. And serving these ends, in turn, contributed to the improvement of the curriculum and of teaching--and, in particular, in developing a student-centered instructional program.

In referring to plans used at Stephens College, I am not suggesting that these would be directly applicable to other junior colleges. There are problems and difficulties associated with faculty-wide participation in advising. I am, however, urging that every junior college actively involve instructors in the student personnel program. Methods of doing this will vary from college to college. But active faculty involvement is essential if the student personnel program is to achieve its potential.

I have suggested that student personnel services can contribute to the improvement of the curriculum and instruction by actively involving instructors in guidance and counseling. Conversely, the student personnel staff can contribute to improving instruction by actively participating in teaching. At times, this may be done in what is essentially a team teaching situation--such as is found in the Junior College District of St. Louis. With the assistance of a grant of $250,000 from the Danforth Foundation, Forest Park Community College, St. Louis, launched in the fall of 1967 "The General Curriculum," a comprehensive program for the educationally disadvantaged. Students who rank at the lowest levels on placement tests are required to enter the program, which has three objectives: (1) to teach students basic academic skills in reading, mathematics, and grammar; (2) to provide students with personal enrichment, a general education suited to their particular background and needs; and (3) to aid students in achieving an adjustment to self and to society.

The use of programed instructional materials under instructor supervision is emphasized in teaching students basic skills. Such materials make it possible for students to work on skills in which they are deficient and to progress at their own rates of speed.

To contribute to the personal enrichment of students, specially planned general education courses have been developed in the humanities, consumer economics, basic sociology, basic science, and science and society. These courses concentrate on contemporary problems and developments which are within the range of students' comprehension. Wide varieties of learning experiences (multimedia instructional materials, field trips, visits to museums, attendance at conferences) are used.

Leading students to achieve an adjustment to self and to society is the core purpose of the program, which is both personal and community centered. This means that the program draws upon and utilizes all appropriate resources of metropolitan St. Louis as an aid to providing for the needs of particular students. Counseling, both individual and group, is featured, so that each student may be placed in a situation which will be best for him--at or outside of the college. Placement may take any of the following forms:

1. In a specific curriculum offered at the college;
2. In a training program offered within the community but not under the auspices of the college (e.g., in Manpower Training Development courses, apprenticeship programs, or area vocational schools);
3. On a job that offers opportunity for advancement and appears to be consistent with student's interests and aptitudes.

For some students, out-of-college placement may take place soon after admission, if such placement is deemed best for the student. For most, however, placement occurs after a period of study in the program, or even perhaps, after its completion.

A low student-counselor ratio makes frequent conferences possible--weekly if necessary. A social worker is employed as a member of the counseling staff to assist in building a bridge of understanding between the college and the environment from which the student comes.

An essential part of the Forest Park plan is clearly the actual involvement of counselors in the instructional program. Also impressive is the extent to which total community resources are utilized. Through counseling, students are placed in situations which are best for them.

Upon occasion, as has been noted, this may be outside of the college--in a training program or perhaps in employment consistent with a student's aptitudes and goals.

Mini-College at El Centro College, Dallas, represents a plan under which counselors are active members of an instructional team. Under this plan five instructors teach five courses (English, History, Art, Psychology, and Mathematics) to the same 180 students. Also participating in the program are a counselor, a reading specialist, and a media specialist.

Mini-College aims to add new dimensions to team teaching as relationships between and among various fields are identified and explored, and as the five instructors and associated staff members, work together in teaching a single group of students. Mini-College also aims to help students achieve a sense of personal identity by becoming members of a small group within a large institution.

All students in Mini-College meet as a group from 10:00 to 10:50 a.m. from Monday through Friday, each course being responsible for one session each week. All instructors attend these sessions which feature guest speakers, films, panels, and upon occasion, lectures by staff members. The sessions are also used for testing purposes. Students meet weekly in groups of 20 in single sessions for each course. Seminars limited to from five to eight students are held for honors work or remedial instruction, as the need dictates. These, independent study and individual counseling, contribute to the personalization and individualization of instruction.

Members of junior college student personnel staffs often participate in teaching which is obviously and directly related to the functions of the program for which they have major responsibility. Counselors, for example, teach orientation courses and, upon occasion, are the designated counselors for students in their classes. At De Anza College, California, counselors teach the required orientation course which features encounter group sessions. Such sessions are reported to have notable value in aiding counselors and students learn more about each other soon after the student enrolls.

At Orange Coast College, California, teacher-counselors--each of whom is a credentialed counselor--teach the required course in introduction to psychology, and serve as counselors to the students in their classes. Teacher-counselors are among those who have taken leadership in using Orange Coast College's nationally known Forum, sometimes referred to as a push button lecture hall. Their leadership has had an influence on teaching--and on the use of the Forum--in a variety of fields.

Counselors at Santa Fe Junior College, Florida, teach the three-credit required "Self-Concept Course. The Individual in a Changing Environment." The focus in the course is on the student, his experiences, goals, values, attitudes and beliefs. Basic encounter groups in which inter-personal relationships are explored are used.

Through teaching this course, members of the student personnel staff systematically have contact with all students. This is, of course, centrally important to the counseling program. Also by virtue of their teaching, counselors are members of the instructional staff and are involved in curriculum developments.

C. Conclusion

Junior college counselors can and do teach in a variety of contexts. Similarly, teachers participate in student personnel programs--also in a variety of contexts.

The point of view which I am expressing--namely that we must recognize the essential unity of our student personnel and our instructional programs--has been strengthened for me by my recent eighteen-month national survey of innovations in junior college instruction. Published under the title, Islands of Innovation Expanding, my report identifies a significant number of encouraging and some truly exciting developments.[9] As I identified new plans of teaching I was impressed with the extent to which many of them are directly relevant to--and some completely dependent upon--student personnel services. Some of the plans to which I have referred in this paper are described in Islands of Innovation Expanding. These are among other developments which I describe in my report and which have obvious relevance to student personnel services: the student operated experimental college at Foothill College, student tutors at Pasadena City College and at Los Angeles Pierce College, student counselors at Los Angeles City College, selected and carefully trained student counselor-teachers at

---

[9] B. Lamar Johnson, Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969).

Virginia Western Community College, programed instruction by teacher-counselors in the orientation course at Kennesaw Junior College, Georgia.

It is clearly impossible to make a survey of instructional practices without including guidance and counseling. It is equally impossible to survey guidance and counseling programs without involving instruction.

Instruction and guidance, and counseling and teaching have an essential unity. Let's exploit it to the fullest. Let us involve instructors in advising and in other aspects of the student personnel program; let us involve counselors in teaching; let us use students in advising and in teaching. Let us break down artificial barriers and move toward a unified educational program--which is relevant, individualized, and personalized.

JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS
"WHO ARE THEY? WHAT ARE THEIR NEEDS?"

James Harvey
Vice President of Student Affairs
William Rainey Harper College

WHO ARE THEY?

Describing junior college students is one of the most difficult tasks anyone could be assigned. It is almost as if one were asked to go out on a winter's night and describe the characteristics of the snow flakes. Though similar in some ways, we are told each snow flake is quite different. Under close scrutiny each presents a beautiful design and a unique individuality. This is true of junior college students also. They share certain characteristics but on close scrutiny each is a beautiful unique individual.

Before moving on to the inevitable generalizations about junior college students let's take a quick walk down the hallway of a typical junior college and talk to a few students.

The college is Every City Community College. Each of the students is real. Each is a composite of students actually known to the writer.

Student 1

"Hi there -- may I speak to you for a minute?"

"Sure"

"I'd like to ask you some questions about yourself and why you're attending Every City Community College."

"O.K. -- shoot."

"First -- how old are you?"

"I'm 18."

"You're a freshman here at Every City?"

"Yes"

"Why did you come here rather than go to another college?"

"Well, there are several reasons. First, my grades in high school weren't too hot and I'm not sure I could get into State University. Second, my parents wanted me to go here because of the costs. I have a brother in State University and my father (he drives a truck for a milk company) can't afford two of us at State University at the same time. Third, I have a pretty good job at a gas station and I didn't want to give it up. Fourthly, my girl is a junior in high school and it is more convenient to go to college here for a couple of years."

"How do you stand with the draft board?"

"Well, they sure aren't going to get me as long as I keep my grades up. My Dad was in World War II and he told me to avoid the service as long as I can."

"Would you be in college if it wasn't for the draft?"

"Yes, I think so. You see my father and brother have convinced me that I need a college education to get a decent job."

"What are your vocational plans?"

"I'm not sure, yet."

"Have you talked to a counselor about it?"

"No, but I guess I should one of these days."

"Did you discuss the matter with you high school counselor?"

"I did once and he suggested that I take some tests but I never got around to doing it."

"How often did you see your high school counselor?"

"Once a semester to make out my program."

"How many hours are you taking?"

"Fifteen"

"How many hours a week do you work?"

"About 20 - 30."

"Do you need to work that much to meet your college expenses?"

"No, but I have other expenses with my car and dating, and I hope to save some so I can go on to State University later."

"How much time do you spend studying outside of class each week?"

"Oh, about two hours or so a day -- maybe less."

"Maybe less?"

"I guess it's closer to an hour a day."

"Do you feel this is enough?"

"I guess I should study more but with work and all it's hard -- and I got through high school without studying much."

"How are your grades?"

"Well, I have only had mid semester grades and I had two D's and two C's, plus a B in P.E. -- but the grades will improve."

"Well, good luck -- thanks for talking to me."

Student II

"Hello -- may I speak to you for a moment?"

"Yes"

"I'd like to ask a few questions about your attendance at Every City Community College."

"All right."

"I see you are one of the adult students here."

"Yes, and even though I'm a woman if you ask my age I'll tell you."

"O.K. -- how old are you?"

"I'm 39 -- and that's not a Jack Benny 39."

"Do you attend evening classes?"

"Yes"

"Why are you attending Every City Community College?"

"Well, I would like to improve myself and prepare for a good job."

"Are there other reasons for your being here?"

"Yes, to be honest with you. I was divorced two years ago and just couldn't bear to sit home alone at night so I decided to come here and take some classes. At least I keep busy, meet new friends, and am on my way to becoming an executive secretary."

"How were your grades in high school?"

"I was a good student. I had a B+ average and made the honor society. I probably would have gone on to college but my boyfriend and I decided to get married right after graduation. My parents advised against it but we insisted. I see now that it was a mistake. The marriage went on the rocks and I was left alone. I didn't even have a good way of supporting myself."

"How are you doing in your classes?"

"Great -- I've gotten all A's and B's and I really love it."

"Thanks for talking to me -- best wishes."

Student III

"Hello -- may I speak to you for a few minutes?"

"Sure, I guess I can spare the time."

"How old are you?"

"I'm 22 and a soph here at Every City."

"Twenty-two is old for a soph isn't it?"

"Yes I volunteered for the draft after high school and spent two years in service."

"Are there many other black students here at the college?"

"We make up about 10% of the student body. We should have more black students because in the district we make up about 25% of the population."

"How does the college react to the needs of the black students?"

"Well, they have done some things -- we have a couple of courses in Afro-American History, a black Student Union, and black counselor. But much more needs to be done."

"Do you find the administration listens to you?"

"Sometimes, I think they will listen harder now because I was just elected student body president."

"How did you accomplish that?"

"Well, we got the blacks united behind me and a number of whites voted for me too. That, plus the fact that many students didn't vote and there were two other white candidates led to my getting a majority of the votes cast."

"Do you feel the college can do more to serve the black community?"

"Yes, a whole lot more. More black students should be here including a lot more adults in the evening program. We need a special program of recruitment, orientation, counseling, tutoring, developmental education and more to fully serve the needs. I really believe we are making progress, however, and hopefully we'll soon be meeting the needs."

"Does your leadership role here affect your grades?"

"It seems to help -- I'm getting all A's and B's. That's a switch because I was lucky to get C's in high school."

"Were you a leader in high school?"

"No, I never was much interested -- the two years in service seemed to give me new confidence in myself and I decided when I got out that I was going to make something of myself."

"What do you plan to do vocationally?"

"I plan to go to law school -- I want to be a lawyer."

"Did your parents encourage your going to college?"

No, not really, in fact, my parents never really encouraged me to do well in high school either."

"Has anyone in your family gone to college before?"

"No, I'm the first. I hope I won't be the last, however, I'm working on my younger brother to come to Every City next year when he graduates from high school."

"Well, good luck with your plans -- thanks for talking to me."

Student IV

"Hello young lady -- may I speak to you?"

"I guess so."

"How long have you been at Every City Community College?"

"This is my second semester."

"Did you come here directly from high school?"

"Yes, I graduated last year."

"How did you happen to come to Every City Community College?"

"Well, several of my girl friends came here, and it's close to home. In fact, I can walk to the campus. My parents wanted me to come here too. Perhaps most importantly though, I wanted to take the one year program in dental assisting."

"I see, then you are in a one year program."

"Yes, I'll graduate next semester. My boyfriend and I will be married this summer -- he's a sophomore -- and I'll work to put him through the last two years at State University. He plans to be a high school teacher and coach."

"Good luck -- thanks for talking to me."

Student V

"Hello -- may I speak to you for a moment?"

"Yes -- what can I do for you?"

"I'd like to ask a few questions about your attendance at Every City Community College."

"O.K. go ahead."

"I see you are one of the adult students -- will you please tell me why you're here?"

"Well, basically for two reasons I guess. First, I'm taking some courses in data processing. You see I'm in a managerial position with a large publishing company and we're switching to data processing in much of our operation and I need to know something about it because of the decisions I must make. In effect, I need this information to keep up to date. I've also been taking a course now and then just for my own self interest and growth. For example, I've always wanted to learn to paint so I took a couple of courses in Art and I really get a great deal of enjoyment out of painting when I have some free time."

"Are you working toward a degree?"

"Oh no, you see I already have a B.A. degree in business, so a degree doesn't interest me. My wife is working on a degree here, however, she is working on an Associate Degree in Nursing and next year my daughter is coming here so we're making Every City Community College a family affair."

"I see -- well, best wishes and thanks for talking to me."

The five students just described through these conversations are not at all atypical. Nearly every junior college in the country would have students similar to these five. The students will come from a vast array of backgrounds. They will come from all social strata, they will be married and single, they will be full and part-time students, and they will vary from those with advanced graduate degrees to those who have not completed high school. They will come for a wide variety of reasons ranging all the way from dodging the draft to an intrinsic desire to learn. They will be of various shapes, sizes, colors, backgrounds, and interests, and all in all they will be the most diversified and heterogeneous group of students ever to enter an institution of higher education.

Let's take a closer look at some of the specific characteristics. Before doing so, however, four basic points must be made.

1. Any generalizations about students must be viewed with caution. This is particularly true if the group is highly diversified. Each student is unique and different and must be treated as such. Useful information can be obtained, however, by studying generalizations and that is the intent of the discussion that follows.

2. Community colleges differ as widely as the communities they serve. The descriptions of students that follow may or may not fit any particular community college.

3. In keeping with the point just made it is essential that each community college study its own student population and their needs. This is the only way a college can be certain that generalizations do or do not apply and that they do in fact understand their own student population and its needs.

4. The research data which serves as the basis for the following generalizations is adequate in some areas such as academic characteristics and socio-economic background, but quite inadequate in other areas such as personality characteristics, attitudes and values.

With these limitations in mind let's take a closer look at the specific characteristics of junior college students. It should be noted at this point that a debt of gratitude is owed to Pat Cross and her recent summarization of the research on the junior college student (8). Her work has greatly aided in the development of the following data.

Academic Characteristics

More information has been gathered about the academic characteristics of junior college students than of any other trait. A plethora of material has been written and statistics have piled high. The problem is that practically all of this information has been gathered on the basis of academic aptitude tests which are designed to predict the success of students at four-year colleges and universities which aim at a high level of intellectual education. Many surmise that if the full range of mental abilities were taken into account junior college students would tend to score higher in some areas than four-year college students. In fact, there is some evidence that in mechanical ability and manipulative skills this is true (8). In other words, fuller testing would probably show a different pattern of abilities not necessarily a lower pattern.

As we look at the data on academic abilities we find that on a number of studies (12) (10) (14) (13) (1) the junior college student tends to score lower on the average than students going on to four-year colleges. He also tends to score higher than those students who do not go on to college. In fact, the curve of students going to the community college as compared to all students going on to college often looks like a camel's back with the front hump removed. At Harper College approximately seventy percent of our students come from the lower two quartiles of their high school class. This is not unusual. In fact, as the changing pattern of higher education takes place in the United States it makes sense that the community college will be serving the needs of many students who in the past have not gone on to higher education. These are the students who by and large have not done well in the kind of intellectual competition in high schools. The ones that succeeded in the competition have often gone on to four-year colleges.

A recent issue of the U.S. News and World Report[1] indicated that in 1940 twelve percent of the high school students in this country went on to higher education. By the 1970's they report seventy percent will be going on to higher education. The twelve percent was largely composed of those at the top of their high school class. The increased percentage that is now going on is coming largely from the lower two quartiles. This group, new to higher education, presents us with a tremendous challenge and opportunity. We need to ask ourselves whether the traditional approaches to higher education will best serve the needs of these students. More on this later.

Another point needs to be made, and that is while the average scores of junior college students tend to be lower the two-year colleges do get students who cover the full range of academic ability. Many students are outstanding. Many come from the upper half of their high school classes. There is a considerable overlap of scores when junior colleges and four-year colleges are compared and the mean score differences are not great. In fact, in the ACT data (6) we find that the composite ACT score (mean) for all level one institutions in the country (two-year institutions) is 18.2 with a standard deviation of 4.8. The composite score (mean) for all level two institutions in the country (four-year colleges) is 19.3 with a standard deviation of 4.9. Those of you statistically oriented can easily see the great overlap in the middle of the curve.

---

[1] U. S. News and World Report, June 23, 1969, p. 45.

Harold Seashore found (12) that twenty-four percent of the junior college men, and twenty percent of the junior college women scored above the median scores for their sex groups in four-year colleges. He also found that a large portion of the junior college freshmen transfer aspirants were as capable as the upper three-fourths of the senior college freshmen. At any rate, the fact is well established that junior college students tend to score lower on the average than freshmen students at four-year colleges. This means that the academic ability as measured on traditional tests of academic aptitude is somewhat lower for junior college students.

Social Economic Background

Pat Cross summarizes the research on the social economic backgrounds of junior college students by saying (8:48) "research findings demonstrate that parents of junior college students tend to have lower social economic status than parents of students entering four-year colleges and universities." Blocker, Plummer and Richardson (3:1-14) indicate the same conclusion and they go on to say (3:1-28) "it is clear that the majority of students seek two-year colleges as an opportunity for upward social and economic mobility -- most are exceeding the education of their parents." To put it another way -- the junior college is a place where the offspring of blue collar workers can earn a white collar.

Burton Clark (5) in his study of the students attending junior college in San Jose, California, found that they represented almost an exact cross section of the city-wide occupational structure while the two universities drawing students from the area drew most of their population from the upper white collar group in the city. He found that three-fourths of the junior college students came from lower white collar worker's homes and blue collar homes.

The evidence seems to be clear that the junior college is serving the needs of those from lower class homes and the lower social economic groups, and it is, in fact, doing the job that many have indicated it should do in the sense that it is democratizing higher education in the United States. This fact has some real implications for the way in which we work with students, particularly in the pre-admissions, induction, and orientation programs. More on this later.

Finances and Work

Many junior college students come because of financial reasons. This is one of the major factors given for attending junior colleges. A study at Flint Community College (11) indicated that fifty-seven percent of the students worked at least part time. Of those that worked sixty-three percent were men and they worked a median of 22 hours per week. The women worked a median of 16.8 hours. More recent data from ACT (2) indicated that only seventeen percent of their junior college sample did not work (2:19). It is clear from our experience at Harper College that the majority of our students are working and, in fact, many are working far more than they should and more than they need to. The Flint study (11) indicated that half of the students who were working said they did not need to work to stay in college. One conclusion of the study was that community colleges should discourage students from working unless it was absolutely necessary. Our experience at Harper College would be similar though it must be said that there are students who can and do work and still do very well in the classroom. Selecting those that can work without harm to their studies is not an easy task and arbitrary rules are not the answer to the problem. Good counseling and advising will do the job.

Thornton (16) reports on a study at Orange Coast College and concludes that most of the students were working to provide non-essentials. In addition, their work was not connected to their vocational goals in any way.

In summary, then, the research seems to indicate that more students come to the junior colleges with financial need than is true of those going to four-year colleges. Many junior college students choose to work and, while there is financial need among many of them, a number work who do not need to, they work in jobs not related to their vocational goals, and many work primarily to provide money for non-essentials.

This is one area in which junior colleges must do more to educate their students to the realities of the demands of college work and the amount of time they can legitimately devote to work without jeopardizing their educational goals. We also have a tremendous opportunity to use the desire to work for the benefit of the student if we can harness it to vocational exploration, to cooperative programs, or to other programs that bring educational as well as monetary benefit.

Age, Sex, Marital Status

The range of ages of junior college students runs all the way from 16 to 70. If the junior college has a program for golden agers it may well run over 70, and on occasions it may even go below 16. When talking about junior college students it is well to divide them into two basic groups -- those who are of college age -- roughly 17 through 21 -- and those who are older. Most community colleges will find that these two groups are about evenly divided in their student bodies on a head count basis (3:107). Medsker found that (10:43) fifty-three percent of the community college students studied were 22 years of age or under while forty-seven percent were 23 years of age and above. A safe generalization of community college students would be that half are roughly of the typical college attending ages while half are over 21 years of age.

As far as sex is concerned the community colleges tend to attract more men than they do women. A Minnesota study (10:46) found that there were two men to every woman. Thornton (16:150) reports that the junior college transfer students tend to follow the national average for all colleges regarding sex with about sixty-two percent of the enrollment being male and thirty-eight percent female. He additionally notes that if you include the terminal students the ratio would move closer to a 3 to 1 distribution of males to females. The evidence seems to indicate that men outnumber women, and, while this is generally on a two to one ratio basis, it may vary somewhat from college to college.

As far as marital status goes, Medsker (10:45) reported that in a study of 8,000 junior college students in six colleges twenty-three percent were married. This compared to a total for all colleges in the country of about twenty-two percent. The total of married students, therefore, in the community college would seem to be slightly higher than that found in four-year colleges and universities. For the evening and part-time students, mainly older adults, the percentage of married students is obviously much higher. In fact, one study (4) indicated that seventy-five percent were married.

Personality Characteristics and Self Concept

Not much is really known about this particular area but some research has been done and is probably best summed up in the words of Pat Cross (8:51) "Junior college students have a more practical orientation to college and to life than do their more intellectually disposed peers in the four-year colleges. They are interested in applied college curricula and expect their future satisfactions to come from business and financial success. Four-year college students are somewhat more likely to value humanitarian pursuits. Junior college students score lower on measures of autonomy and non-authoritarianism; they are more likely to be cautious and controlled, less likely to be venturesome and flexible in their thinking. Taken as a whole, the research picture reveals young people who are not sufficiently sure of themselves to venture into new and untried fields, and they appear to seek more certain pathways to success and financial security." Much more research needs to be done, but we do begin to get the picture of students who definitely need specialized help and new programs and approaches if they are to succeed in college.

In addition, it is fair to say that the junior college probably gets more students who have not completed a satisfactory emancipation from their home and parents. The extreme reactions to this are often evident in overly dependent students on the one hand and the rebellious on the other. In many cases (perhaps most) the problem is as much a fault of the parent as the student, however, it does create conflict and problems that the college must recognize if it is to meet the student's needs. More on this later.

Why Do They Come?

The main reasons students attended a junior college as listed by Medsker (10:47) were: (1) they were persuaded to come by parents, counselors or friends, (2) the location, (3) the cost. The motivations of students are complex and it is difficult to establish which reasons have priority, but it is clear that the low cost and location of the junior college near a student's home are potent attractions. In addition, students come because they want particular two-year programs offered only at the junior college, because their friends are going there, because they couldn't get into any other college and they must go to some college because everybody their age it seems is going, because they want to continue in a job they had in high school, because their parents won't let them go away from home until they are more mature, because their girl friend is still in high school and on and on.

One thing is clear, as compared to four-year college students, the junior college students do not come because of the intellectual atmosphere, nor do they come because of an intrinsic desire to grow intellectually. Their reasons for coming are practical and immediate. In many cases they would prefer to go elsewhere. The junior college is often their second or third choice.

Most students come to prepare to transfer to four-year colleges. The oft quoted figure is that two-thirds come expecting to transfer but only one-third actually ever do. Many come with unrealistic goals and unrealistic educational aspirations. Herein lies a great challenge to the junior colleges, particularly to the counseling and guidance programs.

What Are Their Needs?

Now, we come to the heart of the matter. What does all of this mean? What difference does it make in how we deal with students? What do they need and want?

I don't pretend to have the answers but I do have some thoughts and unless you have the courage to leave right now you are about to hear them. These thoughts are aimed at student personnel people but many of the ideas can be implemented in the instructional area as well. Here goes, and not necessarily in the order of importance.

1. The student needs to understand college. Most junior college students come from homes where parents are not college graduates. Many are the first in their families to go to college. This creates a far greater burden on the junior college to orient students to college than is true of the four-year college. Students need to know what a G.P.A. is, how college work and study differs from what they've known in high school. They need to know how to study, how important it is to keep up, what they need to do in various situations (including how they drop out of college -- officially) and they need to know that they will be treated as adults with all of the ramifications that carries. In many cases our success or failure in the pre-admission and orientation process will determine the success or failure of the student. Few colleges do enough in these areas with the result that many students make fatal errors in judgment because they do not understand college requirements and policies. I don't believe it is unreasonable to expect each college to see to it that each new student spends at least an hour with a counselor prior to admission and that he spend additional time in an orientation class or program which provides the needed information and understanding.

2. The student needs to develop his personality, understand himself, develop sound interpersonal relations with peers, and define his philosophy of life. Some interesting comments have been made in the Hazen Foundation sponsored report entitled The Student in Higher Education (15). The general thesis is that in higher education we have neglected the human dimension and the personality growth of our students as we went

merrily on our way developing a cafeteria serving information. The needs of junior college students in the area of personality development are even greater than at the four-year college level. We have more students who have been unsuccessful in the competition in high school. Their failures there have often resulted in a variety of personal problems. In some cases personality problems of one sort or another have caused the unsatisfactory progress.

Max Raines has noted (11) that junior college students possess less self-esteem in an academic environment than their peers at four-year institutions. He further suggests that we may need to repair the self-esteem of some of our students before they can really benefit from the college program. If you've read the article "Student As Nigger" by Gerald Farber[2] you have read the description of a college student which is perhaps even more true of the typical junior college student than it is of the average four-year college student about whom it is written. If you haven't read it the title carries the message and you can imagine what was said. At any rate, there is a very real need to develop programs that will "liberate" our students.

Programs such as the B.E. 100 at Santa Fe Junior College in Gainesville, Florida, and the Human Potential Seminars at Kendall College in Evanston, Illinois, need to be further studied and evaluated as they seem to hold real hope for expanding this all important dimension of education. In addition, we need to expand the oft acclaimed but frequently neglected counseling programs we talk about.

---

[2] Printed in The California Aggie, Davis, California, May 31, 1967.

Closely related to this is the report of the American Council on Education (1) on entering college freshmen where we find that of the objectives stated by college students as being important, the one that stands about all others is the desire to develop a philosophy of life. What are we doing about this? Very little I'm afraid. Much more could be done in and out of the classroom. Our student activity directors should pay special attention because they in particular have a real potential for utilizing speakers, films, encounter groups, discussions, forums, folk music sessions, etc. which zero in on topics which interest students and promote thought and development in this all important area.

3. The student needs to understand the vocational world and to select a vocation. Anyone who has advised students coming into a junior college for the first time will say "amen" to this one. Many students are undecided. Many have made wrong decisions. The tragedy of seeing a "D" student in high school insisting that he is going to be an M.D. or an engineer is commonplace. Students that have been beaten down and who are desperately grabbing for prestige through association with a status vocation are not uncommon phenomena.

The high school counseling programs do not seem to be doing the job as it needs to be done. Recent SCOPE data (18) indicate that for students going on to junior colleges the majority (over 60%) of the students see their counselor once a semester or less, and many never see a counselor. This is hardly helping students make the kinds of decisions that need to be made.

We must commit a substantial amount of our budgets to hire the counselors we need. We must refrain from giving them administrative chores so they can spend the necessary time with students individually and in groups to do the job they were trained for. Hopefully, they can begin before the student actually begins classes. Much of this work should be done in the summer prior to admission. In addition, we need to upgrade our vocational guidance programs providing up to date information, first hand contact with the vocational world, and sensitive adults who can stimulate students into making valid vocational decisions.

4. The students need to be accepted, loved, and helped to succeed. Now that's a little bit like saying you are for motherhood. Nevertheless, it is a concise statement of what is needed. We need teaching methods, curricula, faculty, student personnel programs and all the rest that are basically student oriented. Not budget oriented, or faculty oriented, or public relations oriented or anything else oriented. We need staff members who live the "love your neighbor concept" rather than just intellectualize about it. Now we in the junior college have done better in this matter than our big brothers at the universities, but we need to do more.

We need to become more student centered than we are and, by the way, being student centered is not synonymous with "pampering" or "spoiling" students as some think. We need to accept each student as a human being of equal worth to any other, and we need to help him uncover his God given ability to use it to the fullest. We need to be models of loving caring human beings. Without this even the best educational program accomplishes very little of value.

Student personnel programs can lead the way in this area through the employment of the right type of staffs and the development of programs that evolve from student needs rather than being copies from the universities or high schools. The challenge is there.

5. The student has a need to feel the junior college is a first rate college. Many of our students have status problems. Some would prefer to be at a four-year institution. Some are at the junior college because they perceive it to be easier or "second rate". We need to take every opportunity to show them that it isn't. First rate teaching, counseling, facilities, curricula, programs, etc. will help convince them. Realistic and appropriate standards established on the basis of the objectives of a program rather than the quality of students or status needs of the faculty will also help. Successful and enthusiastic graduates will be a big assist.

As the changing pattern of higher education pushes into an increasing number of states this problem of status feelings may abate somewhat. Then, more and more students will go to junior colleges in the normal course of events. When you reach the percentages of students attending junior colleges that Florida and California have it becomes easier to build a spirit and a commitment to the college because most of the high school graduates go on to the local junior college. This is not true yet in most states. If the student is constantly apologizing because he is in a junior college he is not going to be a very productive member of the college community. He loses something very important.

The way we present the college in admissions, activities, orientation.

and the way we feel about the college ourselves will be very important in this matter.

6. The student needs to have programs, methods, and materials that are practical and immediacy oriented. Back in 1931 a writer in the Junior College Journal (17) stated that junior college students were more "immediate pleasure" oriented than "future pleasure" oriented. I believe this is still true. I believe that on the whole our students are more oriented to immediate needs and pleasures and, therefore, are less willing to discipline themselves for future goals than are university students. I would also speculate that they are less well endowed intellectually to tackle the many abstract reasoning tasks needed to succeed in our present graduate school oriented educational system. This is one of the reasons they have not done better in the high school competition.

If this is true then our programs need to adapt to these facts and, in effect, we need to work with the students as they are, not as we wish they would be. We need programs and methods that relate to their world, their interests, their perceptions, and their reality -- not ours. We need to take them where they are and educate them for what they can be. In addition, we need to work hard to orient them to college life, college requirements, and to the rewards a college degree brings if they are willing to discipline themselves and develop the "sticktoitiveness" necessary to attain their objectives.

7. The student needs to be placed in appropriate courses and given remediation when weaknesses are indicated. One of the biggest problems

facing junior colleges is in developing adequate means of placing students in appropriate courses when they enter. The College Boards and ACT tests do not seem to offer much help though the new Comparative Guidance and Placement program of the College Entrance Examination Board developed specifically for the junior colleges seems to hold some promise. Each college needs to research its own students and curricula and determine the best criteria for placement in its courses. In addition, many students will need remediation in the basic learning skills. Any junior college without such a program cannot adequately serve its constituency. In some colleges fifty percent or more of the students will need remedial work before they can succeed in college work.

Many students will need help in developing appropriate study skills and in understanding the requirements of college work in terms of time, concentration, and effort needed to succeed. The ultimate goal of this program, as of all education, should be to help the student develop that intrinsic love for learning that will lead him to become a fully motivated self learner.

8. The student needs to be treated as an adult and aided in his emancipation from his home and parents. Perhaps the most important developmental task of the college aged group is their emancipation from home and parents. The college needs to assist the student to understand and handle this problem. Some students are at the junior college because parents refuse to let them go away to college due to lack of trust or inability to handle the loosened emotional ties that going away to college would bring. Other students are so tied emotionally to parents that they can't

stand on their own and couldn't emotionally leave home. Junior college counselors soon get used to parents accompanying students to advising and counseling sessions making it difficult at times to even speak directly to the student.

The college, through its counseling program particularly, but also through its total posture toward students, ought to treat students as adults and give special aid to those that are having problems with the emancipation problem.

Up to now I have really been talking about the full-time college aged student though some of the things I have said also apply to the adult student. Let me spend a few closing words on the adult student.

We don't know a lot about these adults. They attend mainly at night and mostly on a part-time basis. Someone has called them the "night riders" and that term carries some interesting connotations.

Research on the "night riders" is scanty. One study by Chapman (4) indicated that at one California junior college the adult evening students were two-thirds men. The study also indicated that seventy-five percent were married, ten percent were college graduates and most (sixty percent) were between 26 and 45 years of age. According to Blocker, Plummer and Richardson (4) the adults seem to perceive the college as a means to an end. They seem to want to use the college for updating or changing vocations, for developing new skills, for developing new leisure time activities, for meeting new friends or for productively using their spare time.

The adults don't want to be treated like the college aged group.

They do not seem to want to participate in student government (20:125) even one that is especially developed for adult evening students. This study (20) also indicated that they were not strongly interested in social, cultural, or recreational activities. Only five percent were extensively involved, while seventy-three percent were involved in few or none of the activities offered by the college. Most adult students have full-time jobs, family ties, community interests, and it stands to reason that most do not have time or interest for many of the typical college activities. There is a small percentage who will participate, however, and this opportunity should be made available to all, particularly in the cultural activities offered by the college.

The "night riders" need to be studied more. There is evidence that counseling programs especially geared to their needs are welcome and will be used. Marital, vocational, educational, and personal counseling needs are often evident. Beyond this I believe we need to look carefully to see if there are other needs that we can serve that are not taken care of in the community, home, or at work. The best way to find this out is to ask them directly because you'll find they'll give you a straight answer.

In closing let me state that the junior college to me is a fascinating institution. Our students are diverse, but the challenge is exciting. The needs of our students are great but the opportunity is breathtaking. I trust you will find it the same.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Astin, Alexander W. et.al., National Norms for Entering College Freshmen -- Fall 1968, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968.

2. Baird, Leonard, James M. Richards, Jr., Linda Shevel, A Description of Graduates of Two-Year Colleges, A.C.T. Research Report No. 28, American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa, 1969.

3. Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, Richard C. Richardson, Jr., The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1965.

4. Chapman, Charles. "Some Characteristics of the Adult Part Time Students Enrolled in the Public Schools of the Contra Costa During the Fall of 1957," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1959.

5. Clark, Burton R., The Open Door College: A Case Study, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1960.

6. College Student Profiles, American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa, 1968.

7. Cross, Patricia K., "Higher Education's Newest Student," Junior College Journal, Vol. 39:38-42, September, 1968.

8. Cross, Patricia K., The Junior College Student: A Research Description, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1969.

9. D'Amico, Louis A., Max R. Raines, "Employment Characteristics of Flint Junior College Students", Junior College Journal, Vol. 28:193-195, December, 1957.

10. Medsker, Leland L., The Junior College Progress and Prospect, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1960.

11. Raines, Max R., "Characteristics of Junior College Students", National Business Education Quarterly, Vol. 36:13-18, Winter, 1967-1968.

12. Seashore, Harold, "Academic Abilities of Junior College Students", Junior College Journal, Vol. 29:74-80, October, 1958.

13. Seibel, Dean W., "The Nature of the Entering Student", Junior College Journal, Vol. 37:14-17, December, 1966.

14. Seibel, Dean W., "We're Cutting Back Our High School Talent Waste", College Board Review, Spring, 1966.

15. The Student in Higher Education, a committee report to the Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Connecticut, 1968.

16. Thornton Jr., James W., The Community Junior College (2nd Ed.), John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.

17. Tibbets, Fred Lyman, "Student Attitudes in the Junior College", Junior College Journal, Vol. 2:148-151, December, 1931.

18. Tillery, Dale, Denis Donovan, Barbara Sherman, S.C.O.P.E. Grade 11 Profile 1968 Questionnaires Selected Items, A Description Report from the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1969.

19. Wolfle, Dale (Ed.) Americas Resources of Specialized Talent, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, 1954.

20. Unpublished Survey, Flint College, University of Michigan, 1961.

EVALUATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS, "IF IT EXISTS, IT CAN BE MEASURED."

Joseph Fordyce
President
Santa Fe Junior College

Perhaps no greater responsibility, nor one more complex, faces the student personnel administrator than the determination of the means by which the college can determine the efficiency and effectiveness of its student services. We could say exactly the same thing about any other aspect of human behavior, especially of a psychological nature. Any of you who have wrestled with the concept of evaluating teacher performance or student performance, of course, know something of the complexity of this matter. And yet we believe that only by having and using appropriate evaluative devices can there be a true appraisal of student services and, in turn, can there be provided an adequate base for further appropriate development of these programs.

What we would hope to do, therefore, this afternoon is first to review briefly some trends in evaluative procedures in student personnel work and in education generally; second, to point out some of the challenges and difficulties; and third, hopefully, to point toward some positive approaches that might be available to junior colleges for this task.

I have a notion, as I recall reading from Jones and Williamson and all the rest, that very few textbooks, very few authors, very few leaders in the field of student personnel work have concerned themselves very much with evaluation over many, many years of the history of our profession. Evaluation of services has generally tended to lag well behind practices and techniques. Practitioners and theorists within the field have defined their activities primarily on the basis of armchair logic and expected others to accept their conclusions largely on faith -- a good, educated kind of faith, but nevertheless faith. I think a real turning point in this was the work of Froelich a number of years ago, actually in the late 40's; he did begin to study in a fairly organized way evaluative studies and, of course, contributed himself to them. He pointed to some 200 studies that had been published before 1948 that began to bring evaluative studies and techniques to some sort of maturity. Froelich's summary, of course, itself was a considerable impetus to further studies, and there has been since that time a great refinement and a great improvement of the sophistication. I would think that probably there have been about three major trends or tendencies with Froelich and beyond. One of those, it seems to me, has been the development of some insight into the complexities of human behavior by all of the behavioral sciences, with the resulting increased understanding of behavioral changes or lack thereof as a result of guidance or student services, or other kinds of ameliorative service. The mere fact, of course, of the complexity of human behavior in a sense adds to the complications, and yet at the same time I think a recognition of it has moved some of these studies to a more sophisticated level than they would have been otherwise.

A second tendency, it seems to me, was an increased emphasis placed upon an overall approach, and we will come back to talk about this a little later in terms of an all-college evaluation as opposed to any attempt to evaluate guidance and student services apart from the remaining influences of college environment.

A third trend has been that of discarding the search for any one methodology as being the best for all situations, but seeking rather to find that device or combination of devices that seem most appropriate for a particular occasion, a particular setting, a particular program. These studies and reviews, of course, have led us to the recognition of a variety of problems and challenges that must continuously be attended if evaluations are to be more than naive or perhaps even worthless recountings of vague generalizations that may have no relationship to the particular institution, the particular college. Certainly part of the complexity of evaluation and appraisal results from the complexity of the services provided under the general rubric of student personnel services.

It is our hope that, basically, educational services could be evaluated in terms of the changes in human behavior that result therefrom. Anything else, it seems to me, is subsidiary, or secondary, or tertiary, or somewhere else down the priority list. It is apparent, however, that many of the services that generally are subsumed under the heading of student personnel services have only indirect relationship to individual students. Registration procedures, as an example of the indirect services, can hardly be expected to bring about monumental changes in the behavior of students, except perhaps negatively when these procedures are more than usually frustrating.

Similarly, testing programs, financial aid programs, and perhaps others, are designed not so much as means to ends as means to means to ends. These indirect services, it seems to me, can be evaluated not in terms of behavioral changes but only in terms of efficiency. Such services can justify their existence only on the basis that, well managed, they make it possible for the other more direct services to exist and flourish. Included among these factors, situations, activities, or services that do indeed set the stages are important, extremely important, student services. As a matter of fact, how could you run a college without registration? The point we are trying to make is that they have value only in terms of getting the student where other more basic services can take place. As part of this total "stage setting," I would suggest these factors:

> Effective organizational and administrative policies of the total college. I am convinced that nothing good in guidance and student personnel services can take place in a poorly managed college. The totality of the thing has to mesh well before student personnel services can flourish.
>
> Effective organization and adequate staffing of student personnel services.
>
> Clear delineation of responsibilities as among the administrative, instructional, and student personnel faculties.
>
> Clear delineation of who is the student that the college and therefore student services purports to serve.
>
> Effective procedures for sharing information among any members of the total faculty who may be in a position to help.
>
> Clear delineation of the teaching faculty role in guidance.
>
> The maintenance of high morale that permits each segment of the faculty to see and accept its responsibilities while

> holding in high respect the responsibilities and functions of each other segment.
>
> An adequate program of testing or other analytical devices by means of which information necessary to the educational process can be obtained from each student.

The point in regard to these peripheral considerations is that, if the individual student is to be served, the stage management must be smooth, efficient, unobtrustive. Too frequently, these secondary services have come to be considered as primary means or even ends in themselves. Witness the tremendous number of elaborate testing programs in which the assumption seems to exist that the actual taking of the test is somehow or other beneficial to a desirable growth pattern in the students so exposed. Services and evaluation of these services can be meaningful only if the house that provides them is in good order.

If it can be accepted that, in the long run, existence of student personnel services can be justified only in terms of the direct services to students that bring about desirable behavioral changes, it is to them that we should turn, and having turned to them, we run into a number of other kinds of problems.

Certainly one of the first is the problem of definition of goals. Here I continue to hear what seems to me to be a grandiose confusion. Too frequently, the aims of student personnel services have been couched in terms of a particular technique or activity or services; for example, "counseling" is frequently listed as an aim of guidance. Effectiveness of guidance can be determined only in relation to outcomes that can be isolated and described. Generally speaking, moreover, these outcomes must reflect the changes in human behavior that the college expects to produce. Certainly we should have no hope of success, nor indeed would we know when success had been achieved, unless the aims are clear, defined in terms of behavioral changes that can be measured or observed, and agreed upon as legitimate aims of the total college.

In a very real sense, then, student personnel services do not have aims. They must, if they expect any degree of success, share in the formulation of college aims, and provide services and techniques on a cooperative basis with all of the other facilities of the institution to help bring about those changes in student behavior that will insure the meeting of that aim.

Another persistent problem in evaluation has been that of control of variables; guidance and counseling do not operate in a vacuum, but rather within a nexus of inter-related influences upon the individual. Inasmuch as each of these factors, individually or collectively, may compare favorably with the guidance situation in terms of influence, negatively or positively, it becomes extremely difficult to attribute to guidance whatever changes may be noted. This problem has been partially resolved in guidance research by the use of control groups that are similar in all important characteristics to the experimental group with the exception that they do not receive guidance or that aspect of guidance in which the researcher is interested. This device is not completely satisfactory because the matching cannot be perfect and also because subtle influences will continue to enter in such a way that they may be more disturbing to one group than to the other. This condition may, in turn, be partially resolved if the experiment or observation is sufficiently replicated. Certainly one of the things that we would hope would come out of conferences like this is agreement that several of us are going to try devices for measuring effectiveness of programs and counseling results in a number of different settings, and we would begin, it seems to me, to get some results in which we might have more faith.

Another persistent problem has been associated with the time factor. Assuming that "good" results are obtained through evaluative studies made immediately after counseling or guidance, what evidence exists that the gain will persist over a sufficiently long period that the total effect can be considered valuable? Conversely, some research has indicated that, in the long run, counselled individuals made what was considered to be effective adjustment even though immediate evaluation had indicated no significant changes. This would suggest the need for longitudinal studies.

What is success? The challenge here is to find some event of the real world, some circumstances of the non-guidance world against which the effects of guidance can be compared or measured. This is tremendously complex, but I do refer you briefly to a kind of summation of these devices that have been used over a period of time -- some good, some relatively more so:

> First of all, the presence and organization of specific services, about which we have already commented.
>
> Second, the techniques employed and the duties undertaken, almost a job description type of analysis of what goes on in guidance.

Third, client opinion.

Fourth, expert opinion.

Fifth, test results, and I use the term "tests" broadly, especially "before and after;" and

Sixth, external phenomena, including grade point averages, number of dropouts, years on the job, number of promotions.

Basically, our concern here is to find, as we indicated a moment ago, those circumstances or those events of the real world against which the results can be observed and measured. One of the difficulties of this is that the events of the real world will not stand still. They can be shifting and so we add to the complexity.

I have in the mail this morning an excellent reprint of the College Board Review about transferability. As you may know, junior college transfers occupy a considerable part of this picture. Certainly one of the most interesting things in reference to this particular report, as we are concerned with our own guidance services and our own general educative services to enable students to make this transfer effectively, one of the great difficulties, one of the great influences, is the fact that the receiving institutions constitute such an important factor. They not only vary tremendously among each other, but they vary from time to time and from department to department themselves. As you may recall, the original Medsker-Knoells study, in reference to this, noted considerable difference in the success of students from a particular junior college in different upper division colleges. As a matter of fact, as between universities in Florida, the evidence was pretty clear that students from almost all junior colleges did better -- "made higher academic averages" -- at one institution than they did at the other, a fact of which both institutions were equally proud.

If we use such social criteria, for example, as joining organizations, who is to say that the compulsive "joiner" or that the perpetual talker has actually improved his social adjustment? What kind of criteria are you willing to accept that something is good? Job efficiency is excellent as a criterion of the effectiveness of vocational guidance, but who is to say, and on the basis of what kind of judgments, whether or not a man is operating efficiently and with satisfaction anything close to the optimum level for him? The mere presence of a guidance service is hardly serviceable as a criterion against which you can measure either it or any other. If one guidance index is to be used as a criterion to measure the effectiveness of another index, what evidence have we that the original index has the kind of relationship with the events of the real world that we presume it has?

The complexities of these problems, however, should not in any sense be considered insurmountable barriers either to the continuation and expansion and development of the services that we believe to be so vital in meeting legitimate educational aims, nor in the evaluation and assessment of them. Recognition of the problems and complexities should enable us to pursue our evaluations on a continuingly more effective and sophisticated level, rather than discouraging us from attempting this all-important process.

We have tried to suggest an approach at Santa Fe that stems from our current concern for a systems approach in education. We say at the

College that we expect students to take the knowledge of the world, or as much of it as we can impart, in order that, hopefully each student will be better able to:

1. Maintain good mental and physical health for himself, his family, and his community;
2. Understand the cultural heritage to gain perspective of his time and place in the world;
3. Understand his interaction with his biological and physical environment;
4. Develop ability to communicate in speaking and in writing;
5. Develop sound moral and spiritual values;
6. Exercise privileges and responsibilities of democratic citizenship.

Now by the same token, in student personnel work, we have arrived at general agreement upon a group of activities ordinarily conceded to constitute the essence of student personnel work. They include:

Articulation with secondary schools;

Orientation of prospective and new students;

Selection and admissions;

Registration and records;

Advisement and educational guidance;

Vocational advisement and information services;

Counseling;

Financial aid.

The process of evaluation is the process of relating these services to these college aims. First we begin with the college aim, ill-defined, vague, and hazy as it is. We then say we propose to use a particular student personnel service that we believe is going to contribute toward meeting this aim in a meaningful way. Third, we indicate a specific aim, definable and measurable, which presumably is subsumed in the overall aim. Finally, we posit indices of success or of accomplishment. I take most of my illustrations from the birds and the bees, and I was pleased the other morning with something that was reported on Today. The general aim of this particular group was to preserve and improve the health of birds. Now what they were doing--the specific service they were using--was innoculation. The specific aim was to help some ill birds get over the disease that was bothering them. Now the beautiful part was the indication of success. They took the birds out to recuperate in a pen with a fence about six feet high. The index of success was the simplest thing you can imagine. As soon as they could fly over the fence, they were well.

To summarize, then, the following illustrations or examples of the procedure of the progression from the general aim of the college to a specific student service or function, designed in part to meet that aim, to the specific aim or purpose of that particular service, and, finally to possible indications or indices of success, ranging in difficulty from simple number counting to considerably more complex process of measurement and evaluation.

Let's take one or two examples: Suppose we are talking about a college aim of exercising privileges and responsibilities of democratic citizenship. We decide that participation in student government should contribute to that general aim. What would be the basic aim? The basic aim would be widespread responsible participation in those affairs of the college that relate to democratic citizenship. How would you measure its success? A very simple device would be to count the number of students who vote in elections.

As another example, we select the college aim of development of rewarding social and personal patterns of living. We suggest, as a procedure, a course in personal development. Perhaps the specific aim might be the lessening of prejudice and bias on ethnical or racial questions. What would be the measure of success? What would be the indices of success of this? Scores on tests, commercial and homemade, indicative of attitudes and pertinent knowledge, or expert opinion as to campus climate might be acceptable as such an indication.

It seems to me that only by a careful consideration of the goals and the aims of the institution, a willingness to relate particular services to those goals, a refinement of the aims in terms of the specifics that we think can be produced, and finally a judgmental determination of what we are willing to accept as indications that the goal has indeed been met, can we judge our progress.

Let me suggest just one other aspect of this process. We are talking about hypotheses and we have made a great number of assumptions, all of which need in and of themselves to be proved. For example, if you propose to accept participation in college activities as an indication of broadened community citizenship, you recognize immediately that Goldman found negative evidence of that hypothesis. So therefore I scratch one index. As we go along working together cooperatively we test more and more of these hypotheses and determine whether or not the events of the college world can indeed be sufficiently predictive of the events of the later world so that they can have longitudinal meaning. That a distinguished academic record in sociology and social psychology indicates freedom from bias and prejudice is an hypothesis that I suspect we use frequently; I have no particular proof that it is valid. Or again, we assume that the individual most free from racial prejudice is most likely to lead a productive life; I don't know whether we should agree or not. I don't know of any evidence that says racial bias is "bad" for the individual that has it; I wish I could be proved wrong. At any rate, without becoming too complex about this particular point, my point is that what we will accept as an indication of success in any of these areas is something that you, thinking together with your colleagues, agree upon. In that very process, it seems to me, you will have moved forward the art and science of the entire profession.

One final word: There is objection in many quarters to this kind of approach to evaluation, generally on the assumption that by picking apart in this way we might indeed be able to isolate an occasional tree but lose sight completely of the forest. I plead guilty to this, and I don't know exactly what to do about it. I am convinced, however, that in most good student personnel programs there is a kind of gestalcht, a kind of getting out of a narrow frame of reference, a kind of totality of performance that over-rides the value of any specific part. I am sure that there is something more than totality and summation. I leave the evaluations of the gestalcht to our distinguished panel.

THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US
"WHERE ARE WE GOING FROM HERE?"
(Conference Summary)

James L. Wattenbarger
Professor and Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

The task of summarizing a conference which has been as dynamic as this one is one of the most difficult jobs an individual can try to carry out. Each of you has brought certain specifics to this conference; each of you will take certain specifics away. It is not possible for one person to point up all of these specifics. However, I will give you my own impressions with a hope that these may be useful to you in acting as a sounding board for your own impressions.

It seems to me that a major result of this conference has been to "recharge," that is to recommit each of us to the real concern of a student personnel program. It seems to me that we have been saying over and over again for the last couple of days that being human is an important thing and that considering other people as human beings is equally important. If we keep this in mind in our relationships with other people, we have taken a long step toward doing the things that we wish to do in regard to the student personnel services program in community junior colleges.

We have talked about how we select staff and how we work with their development after they have been selected. The approach often taken by professional associations -- the AAUP, NFA, and other organizations is in reality a sound one although sometimes an administrator or board of trustees may not think so. Briefly it means that once you have committed yourself to placing an individual on your staff you have also by that act committed yourself to help him grow and develop. One cannot just toss people aside when they don't behave as he thinks they ought to behave. I think this goes back to a very important process which has been emphasized repeatedly, that is, if you have clearly determined objectives and you know what you're about, you select staff who will help you accomplish these objectives. Then you help keep them with you by sound programs of inservice faculty and staff development.

We have emphasized the need to look at the total college. Just recently, I sat with the staff of a community junior college talking with them about evaluating the student personnel services of programs of that institution. We discovered within a very short period of time that we couldn't evaluate the student personnel services unless we evaluated the total college. The entire college was involved in this process and when one talks about evaluating the student personnel services he is really evaluating the college.

We've also talked about the students -- we've talked about who they are, and we've noted that the students who attend community junior colleges are in many ways different from the students who attend other types of institutions of higher education. They are all human beings, but they come from different backgrounds and have different personal characteristics. These facts must be taken into consideration as a college staff develops a program which will be of value to them. This has peculiar and specific implications for the program of student activities in a community junior college. We have noted this during the past few days.

The evaluation process has received a great amount of our attention during this conference. The evaluation process also actually involves everything. It involves defining objectives, it involves activities, it involves measuring, and it involves redefining objectives and activities. We've emphasized that a college staff needs to recognize the importance of making decisions early about what they are trying to do and then be willing to revise such decisions as a college develops. We've emphasized the importance of defining the objectives clearly and also making clear the personnel needs. No longer can one expect to do a job for student personnel services with a ratio of 1 to 1,200. Someone needs to be told this very explicitly. It takes adequate staff if you're going to assume any kind of responsibility in this area.

We've emphasized again and again the totality of the program and the people who work in it, but we've also emphasized the importance of each individual in this program. The fact that we're dealing with individual students -- someone used the term "snowflake" a couple of times to illustrate the individuality of students -- the importance of the individual counselor, and the importance of each faculty member make it necessary to develop specific techniques and activities which recognize these influences upon a student personnel services program. In employing personnel you have to talk with the individual himself. You cannot select people on the basis of transcripts and telephone conversations.

We talked about using students, using para-professionals to extend services. Students may be particularly useful in recruiting students. We need to recruit people who need education. There are many as yet undefined ways we can learn to use para-professionals which we've not even started to discuss.

I think it has been emphasized both in the small groups and from the platform that the tone of the institution in terms of support for the student personnel services comes from the attitude of the president himself. This appears to mean that if a college doesn't have a good student personnel program a major position upon which to place emphasis is the president himself. If he is not sympathetic, you probably aren't ever going to have a good student personnel program in that institution, and perhaps you'd better shake the dust of the institution from your feet and move along.

I was interested in another comment that came out in several places: that the dean who feels a little guilty because he's not working with students should remind himself that his relationships with staff members may be even more important this his relationships with students. As the staff relates with the students, the dean must relate with the staff. Perhaps this is one of the first things that new deans of student personnel services have to learn: he may be forced to give us some of the pleasures of working with students and spend more time and give more attention to staff development.

I think we've also emphasized that the tone or the atmosphere which is so important does not happen overnight. It takes time to nurture it.

It is necessary that there be some preservice preparation for the staff who will work in student personnel services area in an institution but there must also be a sound program of inservice improvement. A well prepared staff doesn't just happen because they are warm human beings and like people.

I think that we have been saying that one cannot measure or otherwise evaluate student personnel services unless he knows what he is talking about. One has to define it, to look at it, to feel it, to touch it: in other words, you can't measure until you know what you're measuring.

There were a number of other emphases that wandered around through the discussion also. Mainly among these was the assertion that students need to succeed. This seems to be an "odd concept" for institutions of higher education which have based their measures of quality upon the number of people who failed. You are familiar, I am sure, with the usual professional statement which relates high quality with the fact that half the class failed a course or with the fact that only the most "capable" students are admitted. If the M.D.'s operated like many of the professors in colleges, they would accept only those patients whose chances of recovery were already assured. Patients with real troubles would be refused admission to the hospital. The success of a college cannot be measured by the number of people who fail. Students need to succeed, faculty needs to succeed, and the student personnel services staff members need to succeed. The dean of student personnel services has the responsibility on his shoulders to help this occur within his institution.

These conclusions summarize my impressions of this conference. Your own reactions may be somewhat different but I hope they will include a challenge to reexamine your procedures relative to:

1. The worth of each individual, student and faculty.
2. The necessity to identify clearly the objectives of your institution and then;
    a. select persons who can implement the objectives,
    b. provide faculty inservice improvement activities in keeping with the objectives,
    c. develop activities for students related to the characteristics of community college students, and
    d. recognize the totality of the college program.
3. The advisability of using students and para-professionals to extend services.
4. Development of an atmosphere favorable to education including;
    a. a sound attitude on the part of the president.
    b. an inclination toward success rather than failure.

PARTICIPANTS

ALABAMA

(Mrs.) Carrie K. Moore
Mobile State Junior College
Mobile, Alabama 36603

FLORIDA

Clinton G. Cooper
Dean of Student Affairs
Miami-Dade Junior College
South Campus
Miami, Florida

H. D. (Bo) Cotton
Dean of Student Services
Cumberland Campus
Florida Junior College at
Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

Louis W. Garrett
Dean
Florida College
Tample Terrace, Florida 33617

Carlton E. Lipsius
Dean of Student Affairs
Lake City Junior College
and Forest Ranger School
Lake City, Florida

Al. E. Lombana
Director of Student Affairs
Tallahassee Junior College
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

William V. Wagner
Dean of Student Affairs
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

GEORGIA

Johnny L. Arnette
Dean of Students
Albany Junior College
Albany, Georgia 31705

Lawrence E. Dixon
Dean of Students
Andrew College
Cuthbert, Georgia 31740

Carol L. Martin
Dean of Student Affairs
Kennesaw Junior College
Marietta, Georgia 30060

Harris Mynatt
Dean of Students
Dalton Junior College
Dalton, Georgia 30720

KENTUCKY

Robert R. Allen
Admissions Officer
University of Kentucky
Prestonsburg Community College
Prestonsburg, Kentucky 41653

Carl W. Lively
Assistant Director
University of Kentucky
Ashland Community College
Ashland, Kentucky 41101

MISSISSIPPI

William C. Oakes
Dean of Students
Hinds Junior College
Raymond, Mississippi

W. L. Vierling
Director of Student Services
Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College
Jefferson Davis Campus
Gulfport, Mississippi 39501

NORTH CAROLINA

John V. Idol
Dean of Student Personnel Services
Wilkes Community College
Wilkesboro, North Carolina 28697

(Mrs.) Nancy R. Moore
Counselor-Psychometrist
(Director of Student Personnel
  Services--July)
Western Piedmont Community College
Morganton, North Carolina 28655

William D. Tyndall
Dean of Students
Mount Olive Junior College
Mount Olive, North Carolina

C. E. Waller
Dean of Students
Wayne Community College
Goldsboro, North Carolina 27530

SOUTH CAROLINA

C. E. Butler
Dean of Student Affairs
Anderson College
Anderson, South Carolina 29621

John Casoria
University of South Carolina
Union Regional Campus
Union, South Carolina

William C. Sanders
Assistant Director and
  Admissions Officer
University of South Carolina
Aiken Regional Campus
Aiken, South Carolina 29801

TENNESSEE

George L. Mathis
Dean of Students
Cleveland State Community College
Cleveland, Tennessee 37311

VIRGINIA

James E. Guth
Dean of Student Services
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
Clifton Forge, Virginia 24422

Kenneth L. Neathery
Dean of Student Services
Danville Community College
Danville, Virginia 24541

H. H. Simmons
Dean of Student Services
Northern Virginia Community College
Annandale, Virginia 22003

Lyman VanWinkle, Jr.
Dean of Student Services
Blue Ridge Community College
Weyers Cave, Virginia 24486